UNIVERSITY of TASMANIA

Heidegger's Topology of Language: Language and Dwelling

Onur Karamercan, M.A

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Tasmania

February 2018

Declaration of Originality

This thesis-dissertation contains no material which has been submitted previously for a degree or diploma at the University of Tasmania or at any other institution, except by way of background information duly acknowledged. Nor, to the best of my knowledge and belief, does it contain any material previously written or published by another, except where due acknowledgement is made. This thesis-dissertation contains no material which infringes copyright whatsoever.

Signed : Date: 20 February 2018

Onur Karamercan

Statement of Authority of Access

This thesis may be made available for loan and limited copying in accordance with the Copyright Act 1968.

Signed : Date: 20 February 2018

Onur Karamercan

Acknowledgments

First of all, I am indebted to the University of Tasmania for the very generous *Tasmanian Graduate Research Scholarship*, which gave me the opportunity to complete this dissertation. I want to thank the University of Crete and the University at Buffalo (SUNY) for accommodating me during my academic visits in 2015 and 2016. I must mention that I have greatly benefited from our illuminating discussions with Prof. Lee Braver and Prof. Richard Capobianco. I would like to particularly acknowledge Assoc. Prof. Kalliopi Nikolopoulou for her timeless wisdom and *Zorbaesque* friendship. I am indeed grateful to Dr. Richard Corry for his assistance in every step of the process. My sincere thanks go to my supervisors Dr. Ingo Farin and Prof. Jeff Malpas for their excellent guidance and continuous support.

This PhD thesis is the product of a 6 year long thinking that has journeyed over six different cities, and so I must express my gratitude to all my friends, as well as former and present colleagues from Izmir, Ankara, Uppsala, Luxembourg, Rethymno, Buffalo and Hobart, for their valuable companionship, inspiration and motivation. Without the vital company of Hans and Melanie during my time in Hobart and Buffalo would have been far more difficult and less enjoyable. I thank Teresa for assisting me with the final corrections of my dissertation. My conversations with Larelle has not only fostered me intellectually, but also encouraged me to go fishing while still writing my thesis. I appreciate the trust and encouragement that my family has shown for my academic endeavours. Although she will *perhaps* never read my dissertation, I myself have learned a great deal from my dog Robi's tranquil existence. Finally, I must express my gratefulness to Camille for her extraordinary understanding, patience and support, but most importantly for choosing to dwell and journey with me in life.

Contents

Abstract

In my dissertation, I investigate Martin Heidegger's "topology of language" and examine the relationship between being, language, and place through the question of "dwelling". Despite its critical implications, Heidegger's "topology of language" has been neither examined nor discussed in a systematic fashion in his own scholarship. My main purpose is to offer a coherent interpretation of his place-oriented thinking on the meaning of *dwelling* in language by tracing his writings between the 1920s and 1960s. While my main focus is in Heidegger's later thought, I also aim to provide a perspective through which we can compare his later and earlier thought in terms of the topic of dwelling in language.

My hypothesis is as follows: viewing language as the "onto-ethical" dwelling-place of human existence can awaken us to consider what it means to be situated in the "world" and understand our "place" in the *kosmos*. Heidegger's explorations of the "onto-ethical" nature of our situated essence within the boundaries of language helps us identify the "question of language" as an interrogation on the meaning of "place" and "dwelling-place". This distinguishes Heidegger's thinking from the traditional "philosophies of language" that examine the linguistic structure of language(s). Looking into the issue topologically, which means by engaging the question of "being" and problematizing our poetic relation to place; I argue that language is not a mere space of meaning, or a tool of communication, but the "open bounded" site of existence that requires us to journey its different regions, following the movement of the emergence and disappearance of the "words". Therefore, we need to consider the relationship between limit, space, and place in understanding the "taking place" of language.

My two-fold thesis is thus an attempt at addressing the following: 1) Asking the question of language in terms of "dwelling" can help us problematize how we can undergo

a poetic experience with language rather than merely objectifying it. 2) This requires us to understand the threefold connection between the meaning-truth-place of being. In arguing for the view that language is the site of the unfolding of the meaning of being, I critically engage with the recent Capobianco-Sheehan discussion, while remaining in a dialogue with Malpas and Ziarek's topological ideas on the issue. I also trace Heidegger's philosophical journey *between* the Ancient Greek and the Far Eastern thinking, as I bring into view his attempt to leave behind the metaphysics of presence in explicating the threefold link between place, nothingness and language.

sözüg kim tüketür neçe sözlese
aka tınmaz erter bulaklar ara

[Who can exhaust the speech – try as one might
The word streams between sources –of silence– with no halt]

(Yusuf Balasaguni, *Kutadgu Bilig*)

Und die Sage selbst? Ist sie etwas von unserem Sprechen Abgetrenntes, dahin erst eine Brücke geschlagen werden müßte*?* Oder ist die Sage der Strom der Stille, der selbst seine Ufer, das Sagen und unser Nachsagen, verbindet, indem er sie bildet?

[And Saying itself? Is it separated from our speaking, something to which we first must build a bridge? Or is Saying the stream of stillness which in forming them joins its own two banks –the Saying and our saying after it?]

(Martin Heidegger, *Unterwegs zur Sprache*)

michinobe ni
shimizu nagaruru
yanagi kage
shibashi tote koso
tachidomaritsure

[By the roadside
a crystal stream flowing
in the shade of a willow
'Just a moment', I thought
Yet I've lingered long]

(Saigyō, Shinkokinshū)

Introduction

I.

My thinking on the relationship between language, place and dwelling began in 2007, during the Old Turkish Language course by Professor Emine Yılmaz at Hacettepe University in Ankara, Turkey. At the time I did not know about the 20th century German thinker Martin Heidegger's philosophy, as I did not yet have an academic background in philosophy. The etymological explanation that Professor Yılmaz provided about the word *konuşmak*, which is the infinitive form of the reciprocal verb "to speak, discourse, converse, talk" in Turkish, indicates that the verb is derived from *ko(n)mak,* meaning to lay, situate, land on, settle. The same verb is also related to the noun *komşu* meaning "neighbour". Accordingly, *konuşmak* implies situating oneself in the nearness of another person, as well as the common *situatedness* and correspondence of a group of people. This etymological introduction into the relationship between *konuşmak* and *komşu*, (two of the most ordinary and simple words of colloquial Turkish), was my introduction to a topological mode of thinking.

When I first took up Philosophy as an undergraduate in 2007, I started reading the history of ontology and passed through the mazes of ancient Greek thought, Kant and German Idealism. Though, as a Turkish language and literature major, my encounter with existentialism via Sartre, Nietzsche and Camus was what really fascinated me, due to the dialogue between "thinking and poetizing" that was embodied in their writings. In fact, I happened to read Heidegger only by way of reading Nietzsche after following the suggestion of a dear friend of mine. The first text that I read from Heidegger was not his *Being and Time*, but an excerpt from *Overcoming Metaphysics*. This is how I slowly

started to familiarize myself with Heidegger's thought on the question of *being* and language. Heidegger's etymological explorations, unique style of writing, and poetic sensitivity in thinking stimulated me to engage with him, not only from a philosophical perspective, but also from the viewpoint of literature and philology. In a nutshell, situated at the intersection of philosophy, philology, and literature, a truly comparative reading of Heidegger has been pivotal in my topological understanding from the very beginning.

When Thomas Sheehan writes, "As has been said of Hegel, so too here: when it comes to Heidegger, there are no experts, only varying degrees of ignorance"[1], I think he deliberately points out the difficulty of covering Heidegger's thought in its entirety. Heidegger's writings extend over five decades, providing detailed and unusual interpretation of the works of various philosophers, poets, sculptors, architects, and painters. That said, inasmuch as Heidegger's conceptual explorations and findings cannot be ignored, I think the more significant contributions of Heidegger's thought must be sought in his endless efforts to motivate a change in our relation to thinking and language. As Powell remarks, the 20th century has been a "century of language" with many thinkers across disciplines examining the nature of language from diverse perspectives.[2] What makes Heidegger's thought of language stand out is his invitation to embark on an adventure of thinking with language, urging us to *let language speak us*, before we come to scientifically examine it as an object standing over and against us. If we overlook this crucial aspect of his explorations, we would be missing the whole point of his thought. This is why reading Heidegger requires one to develop a *phronesis of* and *for* language.

The origin of Heidegger's philosophy concerns the ground and horizon of the question of being. It asks about *that which makes it possible* for phenomena to make sense

[1] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger*: *A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), xix.
[2] Jeffrey L. Powell, "Introduction" In *Heidegger and Language* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 1.

to human understanding and experience. The answer to that question lies in the "correspondence" that takes place "between" being and human being. The thesis that I defend is that *dwelling* means to be situated within the boundaries of language where our understanding and experience of being occurs. In other words, language is "the between" of being and human being, the very site of dwelling as "cor-respondence" [*Ent-sprechung*]. In that line of thinking, if we focus on the significance of the notion of dwelling, we can have an appropriate understanding of what language means for Heidegger. Likewise, with an appropriate understanding of language, we can appropriately "dwell" in the world. In that regard, I set out to examine the trifold relationship between being, language and place by mainly focusing on his later thought in order to show the topological link between language and dwelling. In this context, the following passage from Heidegger's *Le Thor* seminars is very significant:

> With *Being and Time* . . . the "question of Being" . . . concerns the question of being qua being. It becomes thematic in *Being and Time* under the name of "the question of the meaning [*Sinn*] of being." Later this formulation was given up in favour of that of "the question of the truth of being," and finally in favour of that of "the question concerning the place or location of being" [*Ortschaft des Seins*], from which the name topology of being arose [*Topologie des Seins*]. Three terms which succeed one another and at the same time indicate three steps along the way of thinking: MEANING—TRUTH—PLACE (*topos*). If the question of being is supposed to become clarified, what binds together the three successive formulations must necessarily be disclosed, along with what distinguishes them.[3]

In Heidegger scholarship, there is no real consensus concerning the specific role of these steps of his thinking, while the last one among them, namely, place [*topos*], is surprisingly the one that has received the least scrutiny. The recent Sheehan and Capobianco debate in Heidegger scholarship, however, has provided us with an interesting perspective in looking into Heidegger's "question of being" where the significance of the question of

[3] Martin Heidegger, "Seminar in Le Thor 1968" in *Four Seminars*, trans. Andrew Mitchell and François Raffoul (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 47.

place has become particularly explicit. The core issue of the Capobianco-Sheehan debate, which I highlight in different chapters of my thesis, concerns the source of our understanding and experience of being. Sheehan argues that the source of our "understanding" of being is the hermeneutic sense-making capacity of human existence. Capobianco claims that the source of our "experience" of being belongs to the self-manifestation of being itself. In that context, Malpas' topological interpretation of Heidegger's thought stands out as the third approach on the issue, which particularly focuses on the way in which being and human being are linked via the event (appropriation) [*Ereignis*] as the happening of place. In Malpas' interpretation of Heidegger, place appears as that which encompasses both the meaning and the truth of being and that which makes possible the understanding and the experience of being. In that vein of thinking, I would like to show that the question of being is accessible to our understanding and experience insofar as we can poetically dwell in language.

With my topological account of Heidegger's thought, I explicate the situated essence of human existence in language, engaging Malpas' thought in advocating the primacy of place by expounding our *situatedness* in language. In that regard, I endeavour to explain the link between "meaning", "truth", and "place", which Heidegger himself considers crucial for understanding his thought in a holistic way. In that context, I aim to respond to the Sheehan-Capobianco debate in a constructive way by placing their philosophy in a critical dialogue with a topological mode of thinking.

II.

Hayden Kee has recently observed[4] that the last couple of years have seen much scholarly focus on Heidegger's 'phenomenology of language', which shows the interest in Heidegger scholarship in getting to the bottom of the question of language via phenomenology.[5] I do not undervalue the significance of phenomenological approaches, as phenomenology itself is closely related to philosophical topology. Even as late as the mid-1950s, phenomenology continued to offer Heidegger new philosophical challenges.[6] That said, I do not follow a phenomenological "method" in my own interpretation because remaining bound by the phenomenological mode of inquiry, risks losing the sight of crucial issues related to what Heidegger calls "meditative thinking" [*besinnliches Denken*] and the core issue of language, as is the concern of Heidegger himself[7]. I also think that we should read Heidegger strategically, moving back and forth in different periods of his thinking in order to better grasp the shifts and turns in his thought. Just as we cannot completely debunk the question of phenomenology, we cannot simply impose his earlier position from the 1920s upon his position in the 1950s and 60s, though we can certainly find many traces of his late "thought" in his earlier "philosophy".

Heidegger states that the question of language shaped his path of thinking, commencing from his 1915 dissertation *Duns Scotus' Doctrine of Categories and Theory*

---

[4] Hayden Kee, review of *Proto-Phenomenology and the Nature of Language, Volume I: Dwelling in Speech*, by Lawrence Hatab, Phenomenological Reviews, May 9th, 2017, http://reviews.ophen.org/2017/05/09/lawrence-hatab-proto-phenomenology-and-the-nature-of-language-volume-i-dwelling-in-speech/

[5] Charles Taylor, *The Language Animal: The Full Shape of the Human Linguistic Capacity*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 2016; Andrew Inkpin, *Disclosing the World: On the Phenomenology of Language*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2016; Lawrence Hatab, *Proto-Phenomenology and the Nature of Language: Dwelling in Speech I*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017.

[6] I discuss this issue in the third chapter in detail.

[7] Martin Heidegger, *On the Way to Language*, trans. Peter D. Hertz (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1971), 29. (From here on, *On the Way to Language*.)

of Meaning[8]. So, allow me to briefly summarize the three steps and periods of Heidegger's thought on language in light of this focus:

1) *The Early Period*: Between 1919-1934, Heidegger wrote and published his *magnum opus Being and Time*, and is paramount to stress that it is during this early period in time that Heidegger does not have an explicit account of language and place, though he explores the issue by problematizing the link between discourse [*Rede*] and the world. During this time, his writings and lecture courses are mainly guided by his early hermeneutic and phenomenological investigations. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger attempts to render the question of the "meaning of being" significant, a question that appears to be "forgotten" in the history of Occidental philosophy.[9] In terms of the question of language, Heidegger investigates the notion of "discourse" from a phenomenological perspective in order to clarify the ontological nature of everyday speech and our different relations to it such as "idle-talk" [*Gerede*] and "keeping silent" [*schweigen*]. Nevertheless, for Heidegger, discussing language on its own accord was not a priority in *Being and Time* or in his other works during the late 1920s.[10]

2) *The Middle Period*: Between 1934-1949, Heidegger gave lecture courses on Hölderlin, Nietzsche and pre-Socratic thought with a particular focus on art, poetry and

---

[8] Martin Heidegger, *Mindfulness*. trans. Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary (New York: Continuum, 2006), 365.

[9] Sallis explicates this point in a topological way. One of the major themes in his discussion is that *Being and Time* appears as a limit [*peras*] of Heidegger's thought in that in his subsequent works, Heidegger carried out the de-construction [*Abbau*] of the history of metaphysics, which was the "actual" project that Heidegger set out to accomplish already in *Being and Time*. In the early and middle 1930s, in particular starting with the critique of the Platonist notion of "truth" as correctness, Heidegger took up this challenge in the rest of his thinking which was not possible to before and, most likely, without *Being and Time*. See: *John Sallis, Delimitations: Phenomenology and the End of Metaphsics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995), 171. This point makes even more sense when read in the wake of the chapter called "End(s)" in the same work. See pages 129-130.

[10] "I only know one thing: because reflection on language, and on Being, has determined my path of thinking from early on, therefore their discussion has stayed as far as possible in the background […] Yet it took nearly another ten years before I was able to say what I was thinking-the fitting word is still lacking even today. The prospect of the thinking that labors to answer to the nature of language is still veiled, in all its vastness." (*On the Way to Language*, 8.)

the critique of the essence of modern technology. The "turn" in his focus of thinking can be interpreted as an attempt of confrontation with his terrible political stance between 1932-33, but even more so a change in the "method" of his thinking on the question of being. This transitional period of his thought includes *Hölderlin's Hymns The Germania and Rhine* (1934-35), and *Hölderlin's Hymn The Ister* (1942) lecture courses given at the University of Freiburg on Hölderlin's poetry. They offer significant insights into the meaning of "poetic dwelling" and constitute the origins of Heidegger's more explicit "topology of language". This is also when Heidegger starts developing the notion of the "fourfold" [*Geviert*] in the *Origin of Work of Art* (1935–1937) as the essence of the meaning of dwelling. In 1936 Heidegger wrote his significant yet fragmentary text the *Contributions to Philosophy: From the Event* (1936-1938) where it becomes evident that the early "ontological difference" [*Ontologische Differenz*] is grounded in the notion the event [*Ereignis*], which remains the most important concept for the rest of his entire thinking. Even so, it is the 1946 letter, which is known as the "Letter on Humanism", that is the keystone of the topological turn in Heidegger's thinking, a concentration that becomes explicit with his understanding of language as the "house of being".

3) *The Late Period*: The final stage of Heidegger's thought, which is where we find his fully developed topology of being and language, encompasses the time period after the late 1940s. In particular the 1950s are Heidegger's most productive years in terms of developing his ideas on the relation between dwelling, language and place. His profoundly place-oriented thinking for more than a decade results in the 1951 essay *Building Dwelling Thinking,* and more importantly *On the Way to Language*, 1959, and Heidegger's *magnum opus* on language. In the 1950s, we can also easily follow the traces of his dialogue with Taoism, which is one of the important sources of his post-metaphysical writings in the 1950s and onwards. The most crucial link in this period of his

thought on language is the connection between the "event" and the "way-making movement" of language [*Be-wëgung*] that focuses on the three-fold movement between "silence", "saying", and "speaking". In 1969 Heidegger writes the *Art and Space*, which can be seen as his final significant touch on the relationship between art, space [*Raum*], and place [*Ort*].[11]

III.

In Heidegger's work there are plenty of place-related terms: Dasein (usually translated as being-there), place (or site) [*Ort*, *topos*], world [*Welt*], space [*Raum*], the Region [die *Gegnet*], openness [*Offenheit*], clearing [*Lichtung*], way [*Weg*], way-making movement [*Be-wëgung*], and dwelling [*wohnen*, *Aufenthalten*] are perhaps the most important ones. In Heidegger scholarship these terms are often mentioned in discussing Heidegger's ideas, yet without a particular attention to their space and place-related underpinnings, which, I intend to carry out via my topological approach. Philosophical topology signifies the onto-ethical and hermeneutic approach that investigates the unfolding and folding of the meaning of phenomena with regards to their space and place-related essence. In what follows, when I use the word "topological" as the method of inquiry, it indicates the kind of approach that thinks in terms *of place*. When I use "topology" independently, it simply refers the "philosophical" study of space and place on hermeneutic grounds. Thus, "topology of language" means the place-oriented, onto-ethical and hermeneutic investigation of our experience of being in and with language.

[11] In Heidegger scholarship, there are two sources consisting of collected essays which contain sustained discussions on Heidegger's thought on language from difference perspectives: Joseph J. Kockelman, ed. and trans., *On Heidegger and Language*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972; Jeffrey Powell, ed., *Heidegger and Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Otto Pöggeler was one of the first in Heidegger scholarship who used the term "topology" in relation to Heidegger's thought[12]. Joseph Fell is another important figure that investigated the role the notion of place in Heidegger's thought on being.[13] In the most recent Heidegger scholarship the term topology has been fostered by Malpas, whose works on space and place offer the most encompassing explorations and interpretations of Heidegger's place-oriented thought.[14] Malpas suggests that topology (as a composite of Greek *topos* and *logos*) must be understood in hermeneutic terms as the saying and gathering that belongs to place, differed from the mathematical–geometrical branch of topology[15]. As he argues, "The happening of world occurs first in the calling of language, in the gathering of the thing, in the opening up of the time-space that is also the "taking-place" of place"[16]. As Malpas understands it, it is the task of philosophical topology to show the hermeneutical[17] underpinnings of the situated essence of human existence. Therefore a topological approach investigates the way in which we understand and interpret place in its "taking place", while addressing our very situated–ness in places, both in ontic and ontological registers. A topological study may or may not have a specific conception of place *qua* place, which however does not change the fact that insofar as

[12] Otto Pöggeler, "Heideggers Topology des Seins", in *Man and World*, 2 (1969): 331-56;
Otto Pöggeler, "Heidegger's Topology of Being", in *On Heidegger and Language*, ed. Joseph J. Kockelman (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972), 107-147.
[13] Joseph Fell, *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place*. New York: Columbia Press, 1997.
[14] Jeff Malpas, *Place and Experience: A philosophical Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999; Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006; Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger and the Thinking of Place: Explorations in the Topology of Being*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2012.
[15] "Both "topology" and "*Topologie*" have a specific technical sense that refers to a branch of mathematical geometry that studies the nature of surfaces. Heidegger, however, drawing on the Greek roots that lie embedded in the term—*topos* and *logos*—takes it in the sense of a "saying of place" (*Ort-reden*)". Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, 33.
[16] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, 306.
[17] Malpas announces that his approach is primarily hermeneutical. See: Jeff Malpas, "Place and Situation", in *The Routledge Companion to Hermeneutics*, ed. Jeff Malpas and Hans-Helmuth Gander (London: Taylor & Francis, 2014), 354–366.

phenomena (and our experience of them) are situated in and of place, they can be investigated in topological terms.[18]

In hermeneutic terms, philosophical topology can investigate the very "relation" between the part and the whole and their dynamic interaction[19], as this relation can be grasped as a "situated" one in a particular context. In my thesis I will not focus on the ontic register, e.g. particular geographical, political, cultural places, but rather my concentration will be on the onto-ethical nature of human beings' "situatedness" in the taking place of language, as that which defines the human experience of being in the world.

My dissertation, *Heidegger's Topology of Language: Language and Dwelling* thus aims to shed light upon the place-character of the, 1) situated nature of human existence in the event [*Ereignis*] which is recognizable to human beings in the form of language, as well as, 2) our poetic "relation" to language as our dwelling [*wohnen*] in it. Although topology of being has been mentioned and discussed by Heidegger, Pöggeler, Malpas, and Fell, more recently, "topology of language" has been employed by Ziarek:

> Heidegger is already beginning to think about the *poietic* and *Dichtung* in terms of a topology of language, even if he does not yet call it by this name. Unfolding the "open region," that is, the *Lichtung* or the clearing, the *poietic* dimension of art, puts our everyday world into question, displacing the usual ways in which we represent, know, do, or evaluate, as Heidegger remarks. It can decisively

[18] Sallis' following argument is worth considering: "[…] place is not primarily; whenever one comes to frame a concept of place, one does so always on the basis of place experienced in its intuitive singularity. Thus the concept of place, place in general, place conceived in its generality, as a generality, is something secondary, derivative". Sallis calls ventures to conceptualize place as "transcendental aesthetic". John Sallis, *Topographies* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998), 3.

[19] In that context, in his *The Wholeness of Nature*, Henri Bortoft concentrates on the link between "belonging *together*" and *belonging* together" and offers extremely stimulating thoughts on "part-whole" relationship, which, however, I cannot explore in detail, as doing so would require its own study.

> transform not only our relation to language but also our manner of being in the world.[20]

Engaging with language in a topological way can result in the "mindfulness" [*Besinnung*] of language that "shows how the event happens as the "sitedness" or the emplacing of the time-space of experience into its non-repeatable topology."[21] As such, the "topology of language" that is at issue seeks to provide a new perspective in grounding our relation to language, which should help us in finding a new ground and comporting ourselves toward things. In that framework, my approach can be easily distinguishable, not only from linguistic inquiries on language, but also from what has been generally called "philosophies of language". "Topology of language" does not consider language only as an object of investigation, but as that which grounds human experience of being in the world, thus as an issue that we must consider in its poetic taking place. Investigating the meaning of dwelling in language, then, should indicate a mode of inquiry in which we try to orient and situate our being in and through language.

IV.

The structure of the dissertation emphasizes the conceptual continuity and development in Heidegger's thought so that we can see how and why the issue of language and dwelling are inseparable from one another. The dissertation consists of four chapters that are composed of subsections. Each chapter primarily looks to the conceptual relationship between language and dwelling while engaging other topics in order to provide background to the discussion.

---

[20] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 135.
[21] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 182.

Heidegger's most explicit topological discussions on language are found in the *On the Way to Language.* However, in order to fully understand Heidegger's mature account of language and dwelling, the subject matter should be placed its historical context. To that end, firstly I focus on the middle period of Heidegger's thought from the 1930s and 1940s. Following that, I move on to his mature ideas in 1950s and 1960s, and then return to the early period in the 1920s in order to be able to offer a ground of comparison between the early, middle and late periods on the question of language and dwelling. It is possible to observe that the first two chapters illustrate how being, language and dwelling come to occur through *topos* and *logos*, while the last two chapters indicate how the link between being, language and dwelling is essentially established by *ou-topos*, or the place of no-thingness, and silence. As such, the first and last two chapters can be thought of as a dialogue *between* early and later Heidegger.

In the first chapter, I examine the commencement of Heidegger's explicit thought on language and dwelling by concentrating on his ideas between the mid-1930s and early 1940s. I consider Heidegger's thought from this period as the starting point of his later, more developed position. The main texts I analyse in this chapter are the lecture courses on Hölderlin's hymns *Germania and the Rhein* and *The Ister*. The main idea that I discuss is that the place of poetic dwelling is the between [*das Zwischen*], which is the "onto-ethical" place where any interaction and interrelation between distinct boundaries and regions can come to occur through their mutual "appropriation". In the course of the chapter, I engage with Mitchell's idea of the inter-relational essence of the "thing" [*das Ding*] as well as discuss Malpas' notion of the "limit" [*peras*] and "open boundedness", which constitute the conceptual background of my examinations on the link between language and place. With the discussion on the meaning of dwelling, I discern the topological meaning of language as the between of being and human being and the

emergence of the mutual appropriation of the fourfold. I concentrate on "Germania and the Rhein" and "The Ister" lecture courses, because it is at this stage of his thought where Heidegger starts fleshing out the topological relationship between language and dwelling, and he does so by a poetic examination of Hölderlin's hymns on the essence of rivers. For Heidegger, rivers represent the dynamic event of language and place in their constant flowing. In that regard, I draw attention to the significance of the idea of movement and activity by focusing on the streaming of rivers, which will be a crucial idea in Heidegger's later writings in terms of the link between language and place.

In the second chapter, I focus on Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism" in order to closely scrutinize the statement that "language is the house of the truth of being". This is where the topological link between language and dwelling becomes explicit in terms of the place-character of the essence of the existence of human beings. I discuss the ontological and ethical underpinnings of the topological approach of Heidegger, and discuss in which way Heidegger's "topology of language" could be read as "ethics of language". In that regard, I take issue with Joanna Hodge's work on the matter by dealing with her critique of Heidegger's supposedly lack of an "ethical" account, and explain why in fact Heidegger's non-subjectivistic "ethics" differs from traditional accounts of ethics as moral philosophy. After having explicated why ethics must be thought departing from a topological interpretation of the notion of *ethos* in relation to the issue of "dwelling in language", I discuss the significance of the notion of "truth" or "un-concealment" as *aletheia* with regards to the question of being and language. In that context, I bring to the fore Sheehan-Capobianco discussion with regards to the question of being, language and dwelling. I claim that the essence of human existence (Dasein) must be topologically thought in its relation to the link between language and "the there" [*das Da*] as the "clearing" [*Lichtung*]. In doing so, I clarify the conception of "humanism" that Heidegger

advances and discuss Fell's examination of Heidegger's topology in the *Letter of Humanism.* I specifically focus on the question of humanism by comparing subjectivistic underpinnings of Sartre's existentialism with Heidegger's idea of existence as dwelling in language. I propose to read Heidegger's subsequent thinking as "topology of language", which appears as a critique of philosophy as metaphysics.

In the third chapter, I examine Heidegger's topological thought in *On the Way to Language*. I suggest that the key notion is the "way-making movement" [*Be-wëgung*], which I consider the essence of the "event" of language. I pay particularly close attention to the Far Eastern sources of Heidegger's thinking throughout the chapter. In that context, I show the similarities between the Taoist understanding of the "way" [*Tao*] and Heidegger's understanding of the event of language as the "way-making movement. I consider the relation between "silence", "saying" and "speaking" as the basis of the topological "movement" of words.

In order to better explicate the core issues of his dialogue with the Japanese professor Tezuka on the nature of the unfolding of words, I investigate the "method" in which Heidegger arrives at a poetic interpretation of the Japanese word *Koto Ba*, a discussion which allows me to clarify Heidegger's topological "way" of approaching the matter of language *via Er-örterung*, literally, a dialogue that situates in place. In order to make explicit the necessity of avoiding a conception of language as a mere container of meaning, and communication as the transportation and transference of meaning, I venture to explain "silence" as the origin of the event. In relation to that, I also consider Japanese philosopher Ueda's thought on "hollow words" and the two-fold essence of the relationship between language, nothingness and world. In the context of Heidegger scholarship, I engage with Ziarek's topological and topographical interpretation of

Heidegger, pointing out the sameness of the event with the unfolding of language as the happening of place.

In the rest of the chapter, I consider the relationship between language and technology from a topological perspective. I examine and compare Heidegger's topological account of language as the "way-making movement" and the obstructive nature of modern technology as the "Framework" [*Gestell*]. I link this issue with Heidegger's late notion of "letting-be" (releasedness) [*Gelassenheit*] as a response to the human beings' onto-ethical situation *vis-à-vis* modern technology. This discussion brings us to the notion of the "region" [*die Gegnet*], which appears as the place of "in-dwelling" [*Inständigkeit*] and "non-willing". I show that Heidegger's late understanding of the meaning of being as "letting-be" can be conceived as a tranquil way of undergoing an experience with language in the openness of being in the attempt of resisting the obstructive essence of the "framework".

In the fourth chapter I return to early Heidegger in order to put his middle, late and early thinking in perspective, comparing and discussing the similarities and differences of his account on the link between language and dwelling. Although I principally engage with his ideas from *Being and Time*, I also address Heidegger's other lecture courses from the 1920s. First, I focus on the meaning of dwelling in *Being and Time* with an exegesis of the relation between discourse [*Rede*] and "being-in-the-world" [*In-der-Welt-sein*]. In order to clarify the matter, I take issue with Dreyfus' interpretation of Heidegger where I critically discuss the relationship between "place", "*praxis*" and "existential spatiality". In refuting the primacy of "mindless absorption" as the meaning of dwelling, I bring into view the Dreyfus-McDowell discussion regarding the question of mindfulness in human actions. This discussion allows me to problematize the issue of "idle-talk" [*Gerede*] as the articulation of the average and superficial understanding of the

world. In tracing the hints of a topological account of authentic dwelling in *Being and Time*, I turn to the notion of "groundlessness" [*Bodenlosigkeit*] of "idle-talk" and "silence" as the abysmal ground [*Abgrund*] of discourse. In that regard, I claim that Heidegger's emphasis on "keeping silent", as the abysmal ground of language is the basis of his understanding of dwelling in language. The "no-thing" character of "call of conscious" which invites us to consider the ontological nature of "silence" could be understood as one of the origins of Heidegger's later topology of language and dwelling. Finally, I compare Heidegger's early and late accounts of "dwelling" in engaging with Braver's account of "groundless ground". I conclude the chapter with a discussion of the meaning and role that contextualism plays in Heidegger's early and late thought. In particular, I point to different kinds of holisms that are present in Heidegger's thought such as "being-in-the-world" and "fourfold", while it is the latter that provides us with a better understanding of what it means to dwell.

I. Poetic Dwelling in the 1930s and 1940s

The significance of "poetic dwelling" in Heidegger's later thought has already been long acknowledged.[22] However, despite its overall recognition, there is surprisingly little scrutiny as to how the issue of language, place and poetic dwelling are related.[23] In the following passage, Ziarek concisely summarizes this negligence in Heidegger scholarship:

> Yet all too often only scant attention is paid to language in discussion of Heidegger, or else such discussion becomes too quickly limited to consideration of poetry and art. And in the discussions of Heidegger situated between Continental and Analytic perspectives, the matter of language becomes telescoped into the problematic of ordinary language and/or of logic, as though the aim was to try to domesticate Heidegger's thought back into familiar and recognizable categories and terms. As a result, the latter approaches tend to evacuate precisely the very impetus of Heideggerian thought toward a transformation of our relation to language, a transformation that specifically requires changing the terms and the ways in which we experience language and ourselves in it.[24]

In that context, my principal objective in this chapter is to clarify how Heidegger's comprehensive understanding of the relation between language and dwelling develops in the period between the early 1930s and 1940s. I focus on examining the grounds of poeticality, which Heidegger considers to be the kind of "relation" that is required in investigating the nature of language. I argue that our understandings of "standing in a poetic relationship" means we are to probe further into the question of "poetic dwelling"

[22] For instance, Werner Marx was one of the first scholars who examined the concept poetic dwelling as early as in 1972. See: Werner Marx, "The World in Another Beginning: Poetic Dwelling and the Role of the Poet", in *On Heidegger and Language*, ed. Joseph J. Kockelman (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972), 235-261.

[23] In this context, one of the key figures in the contemporary literature is Jeff Malpas, whose topological interpretation of Heidegger with an intensive concentration on the notions of "situatedness" and "limit", provides a solid conceptual footing in delving into the relation between being, language and place. In this section, I will engage with his thought and explore his understanding of his place as "open-bounded". For Malpas' most extensive discussion of Heidegger's poetic topology, see: Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 211-305.

[24] Krzysztof Ziarek, "Giving Its Word: Event (as) Language", in *Heidegger and Language*, ed. Jeffrey Powell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 103.

from an onto-ethical and topological view point. I take the "onto-ethical" to designate the link between one's being and actions in the world. At issue here is the concept of place as *topos* or *Ort* that neither ought to be understood as a socio-political location nor fixed point in space, but as "finite openness" or "open boundedness". This will be further explained by engaging with Malpas' philosophy of place in the first chapter. In that regard, "onto-ethical" appears as the basic character of philosophical topology. This chapter therefore focuses on explicating the significance of standing in a poetic relation to place, as well as what it means to be "poetically situated" in language.

Starting from the mid-1930s, Heidegger gave a number of lecture courses on Hölderlin at the University of Freiburg. *Hölderlin's Hymns Germania and The Rhine*[25] (1934-35), but essentially *Hölderlin's Hymn: The Ister*[26] (1942) lecture courses provide essential philosophical material for my arguments on the nature of "poetic dwelling", which signifies our "relation" to language.[27] Regarding Heidegger's reading of Hölderlin, much emphasis is given to his earlier *Introduction to Metaphysics*, as it is very helpful in order to better conceive of the issues delineated in *Being and Time*. However, my primary aim is to provide a better way in which we can understand Heidegger's later thought, because this is the period of his philosophy that still needs more scholarly attention. Specifically, *The Ister* lecture courses provide an opening to grasp the issues that become explicit in the "Letter on Humanism" (1947), which will help us locate the problem of dwelling in its broader context and further clarify the way in which being and dwelling are

[25]Martin Heidegger. *Hölderlin's Hymns Germania and Rhine*, trans. William McNeill and Julia Ireland, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.
[26] Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlin's Hymn: The Ister*, trans. William McNeill and Julia Davis, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996. (From here on: *The Ister*)
[27] Schmidt argues that one of the most important objectives of the lecture courses was to offer insights concerning the possibility of a renewal of the culture by means of poetic language, yet without putting the matters in nationalistic terms. Schmidt argues that the project was a big failure, yet I think that we cannot disregard Heidegger's conceptual findings in these lecture courses, which help him in the 1940s and 1950s to develop a topological mode of thinking. Dennis Schmidt J., *On Germans and Other Greeks*: *Tragedy and Ethical Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 238.

related. My discussions in this chapter will provide a firm footing for the next chapter to examine Heidegger's statement that "language is the house of being" in the "Letter on Humanism", as well as allow me to clarify the conceptual and historical basis of the crucial topological notion of the fourfold [*Geviert*] from 1949 and onwards.

(1) I introduce the notion of "the between*"* [*Das Zwischen*], and argue that it is the place of poetic dwelling.[28] In explaining the nature of "the between", I discuss Andrew Mitchell's idea of *relationality* and the topological implications of the idea of limit as *peras,* and how it is related to the issue of mortality.

(2) I examine how Heidegger's interpretation of Sophocles' Antigone as the poetic *between* allows us to problematize the topological nature of poetic dwelling and brings out the reciprocal relation between mortals and immortals. In relation to this, I engage with Mark Wrathall's idea of "mutual conditioning" and compare it with Malpas' understanding of place.

(3) I compare Antigone's poetic dwelling with Hölderlin's hymn on the river Ister and elaborate Heidegger's analysis of the temporal-spatial essence of dwelling as becoming homely, and its relation to place.

(4) I explain the relation and differences between poesy [*Poesie*] and poetry [*Dichtung*]. I make explicit the meaning of poetic dwelling and argue that one significant meaning of poeticality is creativity, explaining that the kind of creativity that is at issue, however, is not the same as "productivity", but a sense of making space for the gathering of the thing.

(5) I discuss how Heidegger's idea of poetic dwelling in the early 1940s essentially constitutes the basis of the later notion of the fourfold [*Geviert*], and explain the

[28] In the second chapter, I will show that the notion Heidegger uses to designate the place of dwelling, or dwelling place, is *ethos*. This is an issue that becomes explicit in the "Letter on Humanism".

topological relation between the fourfold and language. I engage with the Capobianco-Sheehan discussion with regards to the role of place, fourfold and its relation to being. My "onto-ethical" approach will allow me to problematize the tension between "ontology" and "ethics", as well "being" and "action", which will also be a central issue in the second chapter of my dissertation.

I. 1 The Between: The Poet as the Demigod

Tragedy, as one of the most ancient literary forms of drama, poetically questions mortals' struggle against fate and necessity. Tragedy has always been at the centre of philosophical thought, seen in the dialogue of educational and political thought in Plato and Aristotle, through to the more recent German philosophy with its focus on the tension between "natural necessity and human freedom".[29] Schmidt astutely highlights[30] that we must be aware that since Kant, German philosophy has yielded different, yet correlated understandings of "tragedy. Hegel, Schelling, Hölderlin, Nietzsche, and Heidegger all have their own interpretations as to how to make sense of tragedy. In what follows, the understanding of tragedy as this "situation" between mortals and immortals,[31] will be considered with reference to Heidegger's reading of Hölderlin's interpretation of Greek tragedy[32]. "Situation" as a "necessary"[33] issue, and one that concerns the finite human

[29] Véronique Foti, *Epochal Discordance: Hölderlin's Philosophy of Tragedy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2006), 8.
[30] Dennis Schmidt J., *On Germans and Other Greeks*: *Tragedy and Ethical Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), xii.
[31] Kalliopi Nikolopoulou, *Tragically Speaking: On the Use and Abuse of Theory for Life* (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), xli.
[32] Heidegger's idiosyncratic appropriation of Hölderlin indeed requires its own study, which cannot be done within the limits of my dissertation. In this regard Gosetti-Ferencei's examination of Heidegger's reading of Hölderlin is a thought-provoking one. Two of her major arguments are as follows: 1) Heidegger's interpretation of Hölderlin mostly overlooks the place of Hölderlin's thought vis-à-vis Kant and German idealism. 2) When we scrutinize Hölderlin's understanding of "poetic subject", we would see that his project also shows a commitment to Enlightenment ideals.

nature, that thus cannot be "technologically" settled. It needs to be "poetically" encountered, in understanding both the "mortals" and "immortals", and the very hermeneutic "inter-relation" *between* them. If, as Aristotle describes, tragedy is an "'imitation' not of men, but of an action and of life, and life consists in action"[34], then, this requires us to heed the very "site" of this "action" as "inter-action", which gathers mortals and immortals in place.

In Heidegger's thought of the 1930s and 1940s, the place of poetic dwelling is "the between" [*das Zwischen*], and I thus discuss the topological implications of this issue. Since "the between" is inherently related to the question of space and place, the issue requires a topological inquiry.[35] I consider Heidegger's concentration on the notion as a direct result of his engagement with Hölderlin's poetry[36], which itself is an outcome of his

---

In arguing so, Gasetti-Ferencei tries to take distance from Heidegger's political ideas from the early 1930s. In favoring later Heidegger's "*Gelassenheit*" as a poetic way of "letting-be" over his early violently heroic and "resolute" Dasein, Gasetti-Ferencei deliberately shows why Heidegger's later thought stands essentially closer to his pre- *Being and Time* hermeneutical phenomenology of "facticity" and is more appropriate for an authentic understanding of poetic subject and poetic language. Jennifer Anna Gasetti-Ferencei, Heidegger, Hölderlin, and the Subject of Poetic Language: Toward a New Poetics of Dasein (New York: Fordham University Press, 2004), 2-5, 8.

[33] What Schmidt explains with regards to the contradiction between "*techne*" and "*necessity*" is significant especially considering Heidegger's engagement with "Pre-socratic" thought. The Socratic thought understands "*techne*" as knowledge. Heidegger's reinterpretation of *techne* as "art" (as that which makes and gathers the "world") and how he distinguishes it from mere "*techne*" as *Technik* indicates that he had already engaged with the problem of the "end of philosophy" beginning with his thought on ancient Greek tragedy. This is because for Heidegger, as Schmidt also notes, the ancient Greek tragedy paves the way to the discussions of the crisis of history that was also being experienced in the Occident in the 20th century. On the other hand, Pre-socratic thinkers like Parmenides, Heraclitus and Anaximander, whose thinking has indeed defined the course of the intellectual history of the Occident, had more appropriate ways of understanding "necessity". Their "*theoria*", that is, their "view" of things, was not "technical", but "poetic", and in a certain sense "tragic". Dennis Schmidt J., *On Germans and Other Greeks*: *Tragedy and Ethical Life*. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 234-235, 238.

[34] Aristotle, *Poetics*: 1450a 16-18.

[35] Drawing on Plato's dialogue of *Symposium*, Krell finds a parallel between the notion of *daimon* and the between, both of which play a key role in Heidegger's thought starting from the late 1920s and onwards. Krell's thesis is that "the realm of the *daimonic*" is the between that gathers the world, and thus opens up to the very idea of "life". David F Krell, *The Daimon Life*: *Heidegger and Life Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), xi.

[36] Bernasconi explains why Hölderlin's poetry was so important to Heidegger: "Hölderlin was for Heidegger the poet who, if the Germans decided in his favor by listening to the language of his poetry, could lead them to another place, a place where Western metaphysics no longer held sway. This is why Hölderlin was for Heidegger not one poet among others but a destiny for philosophy."

long engagement with Greek tragedy.[37] In discussing Hölderlin's poem "Rousseau", Heidegger claims that the dwelling place of the poet is "the between" of the people and the gods.[38] In *The Ister* lecture courses, he argues:

> The poet of such poetizing therefore necessarily stands between human beings and gods. He is no longer merely a human being. Yet for the same reason he is not, indeed never is, a god. From the perspective of this "between" between humans and gods, the poet is a "demigod".[39]

As can be observed here, Heidegger's initial explorations do not directly consider the idea of *between-ness* with regards to the relation between being and human beings, but with regards to human beings and gods. However, this does not mean that for Heidegger gods can be taken to be the equivalent of being [*Sein*] as a supernatural power. Being does not have "agency" and is not a "subject". Rather, for Heidegger being is not an "object" or a "thing" either, but very literally said, it is "no-thing", that which makes things appear as things (just as the "thing" is what allows being to manifest itself as "no-thingness"). In talking about human beings and gods, Heidegger's main purpose is to clarify, the hermeneutic nature of the poet as the demi-god, in order to develop a preliminary definition of "the between" and dwelling. In the 1950s, Heidegger will go on to put forward an understanding of poetry as the most fundamental "hermeneutic" endeavour,

---

Robert Bernasconi, "Poets as Prophets and as Painters: Heidegger's Turn to Poetic Language and the Hölderlinian Turn in Context." In *Heidegger and Language*, ed. Jeffrey Powell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 146. I will make explicit why Hölderlin was crucial for Heidegger, specifically in hermeneutic terms. What I find particularly significant is that Heidegger saw Hölderlin's poetry as a site in which philosophers and poets could remain in an open dialogue, a dialogue that is essentially needed for the fate of thinking itself in moving beyond the philosophical paradigms where language has been considered only as a object of study, but not as that which transforms the human being's correspondence to being.

[37] Krell explains in great detail the background of Hölderlin's engagement with Greek tragedy and poetry. See: David F. Krell, *The Tragic Absolute: German Idealism and The Languishing of God* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 250-256.

[38] Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlin's Hymns Germania and Rhine*, trans. by William McNeill and Julia Ireland (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 30-31.

[39] (*The Ister*, 139)

appealing us to bear in mind the link between the ancient Greek god Hermes and hermeneutics. It may be useful to consider a passage from Heidegger's later thought to have a sense in which direction Heidegger's thinking will move:

> The expression "hermeneutic" derives from the Greek verb *hermeneuein.* That verb is related to the noun *hermeneus,* which is referable to the name of the god Hermes by a playful thinking that is more compelling than the rigor of science. Hermes is the divine messenger. He brings the message of destiny; *hermeneuein* is that exposition which brings tidings because it can listen to a message. Such exposition becomes an interpretation of what has been said earlier by the poets who, according to Socrates in Plato's Ion (534e), *hermenes eisin ton theon* "are interpreters of the gods.[40]

In this passage we can see that for Heidegger the "between" is the "hermeneut" precisely as the dweller of this interval, the middle space between the people and gods. Thias does not presume, the poet, a mere herald that transmits pieces of information from one ear to another but the poet stands in the openness of understanding and interpreting both voices from the sphere of the familiar and ordinary, and the unfamiliar and extraordinary.

Heidegger makes his case regarding the idea of *betweenness* via examining Sophocles' *Antigone* and Hölderlin's hymn *The Ister*. As I will discuss, both Antigone and the river Ister appear as the *between* of the people and gods.[41] In other words, Antigone and the Ister represent the same poetic and hermeneutic *ethos*[42]. According to Heidegger, by inhabiting the between of the people and gods, the poet makes manifest *the* space and place between mortality and immortality. Here we can ask whether the poet appears as a mere messenger in the sense that she or he establishes the communication between gods and the people by reporting and revealing their respective messages? What is the hermeneutic nature of that which the poet communicates? Insofar as Heidegger engages

[40] (*On the Way to Language*, 29)
[41] (*The Ister*, 142)
[42] I use the Greek word *ethos* here in the more common sense of character, but also with an emphasis on the more ancient and seldom used sense of dwelling-place.

with the question of the "between" by looking into the ancient Greek tragedy[43] (and Hölderlin's hymns), the *situatedness* of the poet in the "middle space" does not imply mere "mediocrity". The middle space in between is not a mere gap that requires being externally bridged. It is not the poet's averageness or seclusion from the extremes that situates her or him in the between, but on the contrary: it is thanks to the between, that is, the dwelling of the poet, the dwelling of the people and the god becomes a matter of understanding and experience in language.

Now let me clarify the spatial and topological implications of the between. First of all, the between is not some empty space that stretches between two "points" in space but two opposites or ends which appear as regions insofar as the middle space relates them to one another, by bringing and letting them co-exist in the same body of space. In other words, it lets them constitute a context. This means, that which the between connects cannot be thought as presences, but rather as relations. As such, the between is not a mere empty passage, but rather it is a happening, an event, as it establishes the movement between things by providing the required space and spacing for them. In recent Heidegger scholarship, Andrew Mitchell discusses the notion of the between, and argues that the notion could be understood as "medium". He also suggests that "medium" does not denote a pre-defined, empty and neutral space that is fixed between two poles.[44] Mitchell claims: "This is what it means to be between (to "bear" it): that the supposedly antipodal, the parties of conflict, are born out of the between; the between does not derive from the

[43] Schmidt explains the history of the appearance and disappearance of tragedy as a philosophical theme in Heidegger's thought. It is crucial to note that Schmidt argues that tragedy allowed Heidegger to make an issue of the poetic dimension of language, which, then would imply that engaging with the question of tragedy actually provided an unprecedented opening in Heideggers's thought, which, before 1930s was rather limited. It can be said that, by way of tragedy, Heidegger took on the "heroic attitude" in terms of leaving behind the dimension of the "familiar" (philosophy) in moving toward the "unknown" and "uncanny" (meditative thinking). Dennis Schmidt J. *On Germans and Other Greeks: Tragedy and Ethical Life*. (Bloomi on languagengton: Indiana University Press, 2001), 228-229, 265.

[44] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 5.

separation of two independent or indifferent entities"[45]. As such, it is the between as the "medium" that accomplishes the happening of the correlativity of two ends of a dimension that delimit one another.

According to Heidegger, things always exist relationally, and their *relationality* is precisely what allows them to appear in the same context. Mitchell calls this the "hospitality" of things[46]. It is the middle space that "hosts", that is, provides space for distinct ends of a dimension in the same body and place. Mitchell's account of the between (as the medium) is one of the most important aspects of his major thesis concerning the inter-relationality of things, which he takes to be the central idea in Heidegger's later thinking. Accordingly, things can exist as things insofar as there is the between because it is the between that makes them present for one another in the first place. If we are not to understand the between as mere mediacy, then, to stand in a relation to another thing also must be grasped as follows: to be encompassed in the context of manifold interactions and interrelations. This shifts our focus from an account of place as fixed presence to a dynamic one that requires movement. Now, as Heidegger attempts to explain "existence" itself as that very "between", the poet as demi-god, is capable of hermeneutically journeying between the people and the gods (immortals), which represent two different modes of dwelling. In that context, let us look into the key idea of finitude and death as the limit of human existence. This idea is crucial in understanding the link between being, language, and human being, an issue that will be important in the following chapters regarding the kinetic nature of dwelling in language as well.

[45] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*, 282.
[46] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*, 5.

I. 2 Limit, Finitude, Mortality

In Heidegger's thought, the poets are the dwellers of the middle space between the people and gods (immortals). The key idea is that human beings can fulfil the utmost potential of their existence (poetical dwelling) if they can manage to die as mortals.[47] Poetical dwelling is an onto-ethical possibility of authentic existence, and as Mitchell also indicates,[48] not all human beings can live up to this possibility. Heidegger must agree with Socrates' statement that "the unexamined life is not worth living,"[49] granted that we define the "examined life" as a life devoted to the question concerning the meaning of being. This becomes possible, first and foremost, by engaging with the question of mortality as the most significant manifestation of human finitude.

First, let me clarify Heidegger's following idea that Mitchell underlines: only those who poetically dwell are mortals. In other words, those who genuinely experience mortality and human finitude dwell poetically. For Heidegger, only poets (in the sense of those who are capable of dwelling poetically) are capable of dying as mortals, because the act of dying that is at issue is not simply a biological event as the termination of one's life activity. One's capacity to die signifies one's openness to experience one's own finite nature. As such, this indicates attentiveness to the un-folding of the future into the limits of the present (no-thingness into the presence) and the ceaseless disclosure of one's existential possibilities in that open-ended, yet bounded space. It is not an ontological universal for all[50] because not all are capable of confronting and experiencing their

[47] Martin Heidegger, *Basic Writings*, ed. David Farrell Krell (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1993), 352. (From here on: *Basic Writings*)
[48] Andrew Mitchell, "Heidegger's Later Thinking of Animality: The End of World Poverty", *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* 1 (2011): 80-81.
[49] (Apology, 38a 5-6.)
[50] Mitchell emphasizes the same point in arguing that we should not see mortality as a privilege, but an exposure. It is an existential situation into which we are thrown. Andrew Mitchell,

mortality in this way. One of the onto-ethical reasons behind this is in the everydayness, human beings (the people) marginalize the fact that they are mortals, which leads to the fact that their dwelling region remains as a self-enclosed field without the openness to experience existence in its fullness. In everyday life, the people tend to consider death as an "extraordinary" event that will arrive one day in the future and take away their lives, because they accept life as the space of the "ordinary", as the region in which things are "present". The idea of death suggests a big threat to this state of constancy. Yet, to be a poet means to persistently own one's proper situatedness in "the between" of birth and death. This means, the poet does not consider "existence" as mere presence, but as the interface and the movement between appearance and disappearance, being and nothingness. Such an understanding of "existence" situates the poet in the actual taking place of nature as *physis*.

In line with his interpretation of Sophocles and Hölderlin, Heidegger distinguishes "poetic dwelling" from "non-poetic dwelling" on the basis of the hermeneutical stance that the poet takes *vis-à-vis* finitude. The poet is not entirely absorbed in the midst of beings, as she or he is capable of responding to the necessity of encountering the limits of existence. Heidegger argues that the poet and the river are the same[51], in the sense that both the poet and the river inhabit the "earth" in the same way, in journeying between life and death, absence and presence. In identifying (and experiencing) what demarcates her or his proper dwelling region, that is, existence as the between of life and death, the poet remains in the openness of understanding and interpreting a holy way of being which belongs to the immortals. For Heidegger, the ultimate limit that grounds finite human existence is mortality, mediated by one's always approaching death, which defines the

---

"Heidegger's Later Thinking of Animality: The End of World Poverty", *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* 1 (2011): 81.

[51] (*The Ister*, 166)

condition of dwelling for the mortals on the earth. "There is only one thing against which all violence shatters. That is death. It is an end beyond all completion, a limit beyond all limits"[52]. A crucial question unfolds: what does it mean to poetically experience death and what is the topological relation between limit and death?

In Heidegger scholarship, Malpas makes explicit Heidegger's understanding of "limit" as *peras*. Concerning the relation between the limit and death, Malpas argues: "Death marks a limit to our being as mortals, but not as a mere stopping point for our lives. Here Heidegger's recurrent emphasis on limit as essentially "horizonal" comes into view once more—death is the limit that opens up the "space" within which our lives can be lived."[53] The topological significance of that thought is that the poetic experience of the limit that divides mortals and immortals is also what gathers them in the same neighbourhood. Their respective existential relation to death differs, yet this difference is precisely what unites them in two bounding regions of the same "neighbourhood". As such, limit manifests and gathers the very ground of relation of two dwelling regions. When I look at the horizon, I can distinguish the blue of the sky from the blue of the sea, thanks to the horizon line [*chorismos*].[54] The limit simultaneously discloses two dimensions by gathering two phenomena in the utmost proximity and at the same time "separating" them from one another. In that way, two spheres that are related by the limit do not appear as mere opposites, but correspondents, literally, they co-(r)respond to each other. This correspondence makes possible a reciprocal movement as a correlation, which

[52] Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000), 168

[53] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 273.

[54] In that context, it can be useful to briefly consider Gadamer's understanding of "horizon". In *Truth and Method*, Gadamer argues that to have a horizon means to be able to look beyond the present, and unite one's past, present and future. "A horizon is not a rigid boundary but something that moves with one and invites one to advance further." Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (London & New York: Continuum, 2004), 238, 301.

is the extension of each constituent to its counterpart. Therefore, it is first and foremost the limit that allows the space and spacing within which things can come to meaningful presence, simply by delimiting and differentiating corresponding boundaries.

In relation to the spatial essence of the issue, the temporal relation between limit and finitude is also crucial. Yet, it must be noted that the idea of death cannot be explicated only in temporal terms, particularly if by "temporality" we only understand the consequential, calculable sense of time. First, death never appears as an occurrence that takes place in time but always as the utmost possibility of existence, namely, as the end. The limit is neither inside nor outside the "space", but it is where both the "inside" and the "outside" begin moving in opposite directions. In other words, death is not "in" time, but it determines the temporal extension of time as such. Time, as the divisible and calculable measure of temporal experience, is derivative of a more original experience of time as existence, as our standing forth into the world, as the openness of being. Although death primarily demarcates the "here" as the possible, it also signifies the "beyond" as the impossible. Yet, that which is beyond and that which withdraws from presence is precisely what demarcates the space of the *presencing* itself. Therefore it is possible to understand death as the abysmal ground of existence, as that which grounds our being in the world, precisely by virtue of not being a ground itself.[55] Thus, "the here" as the space of the possible is disclosed in its entirety against the backdrop of the impossible. By virtue of being the "end", death gives a horizon in which one's meaningful understanding of existence becomes possible. In other words, it gathers and holds together one's being in the world by demarcating the boundaries of existence.

As I have explicated above, death delimits, gathers and discloses the boundaries of the "possible" and the "impossible". It is in that sense that the poet's engagement with the

[55] I will dwell on that issue in the fourth chapter in my discussion of *Being and Time*.

limit [*peras*] renders her or him as the dweller of "the between"[56]. With that in view, the idea that the poet dwells in the nearness of that limit can make better sense: the poet acknowledges the limit as that which discloses the site of dwelling for the mortals. That is to say, the poetic dweller experiences the presencing of both "regions" (the site of mortals and immortals) and is located between these sites of dwelling. Now, let me elaborate on how the poetic limit both gathers mortals and immortals in the same horizon, differentiating and situating them in distinct boundaries. This would allow us to see how the issue I have raised so far with regards to the notion of "the between" is relevant in discussing the notion of the "fourfold" and the meaning of dwelling.

I. 3 Mortals, Immortals, Finitude

Here, I will primarily show the way in which Heidegger's thinking on the relation between mortals and immortals in the 1930s and 1940s constitutes the topological foundations of the notion of the fourfold since it is one's onto-ethical relation to death and finitude that demarcates one's site of dwelling. Heidegger's concentration in discussing the significance of immortals for human dwelling is a result of his engagement with Hölderlin.[57] Like Wrathall, I find immortals (or gods) to be the most difficult component of Heidegger's fourfold.[58] In order to comprehend how Heidegger's understanding of the

[56] In that framework, Malpas also claims,"to have a life is precisely to have a sense of the bounds of that life, of what is part of it and what is not, of what is possible within it and what is not so possible. Jeff Malpas, "Death and the Unity of a Life", in *Death and Philosophy,* ed. Jeff Malpas and Robert Solomon (London & New York: Routledge, 1998), 109.

[57] "Heidegger's later presentation of God, the gods, the last God, the dead God, the God of metaphysics, godhood, the flown gods, the arriving gods, the divinities, the holy, the unholy, the hale and the unhale, all arrive as matters for thinking after his 1934 encounter with Hölderlin. In Hölderlin, Heidegger found a poetic thinking of divinity's abandonment, a thinking that he could hold over and against the death of God announced by Nietzsche." Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 163.

[58] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 205.

immortals develops in the mid-1930s and 1940s and to determine what its implications are, it is necessary to better conceive what it means for the poet to dwell as a demigod.

One of the most striking features of Heidegger's application of the notion of the immortals (or the divinities, the godly ones [*die Unsterblichen*, *die Göttlichen*]) is that he preferred to use the word in the plural form. This should hint to us that Heidegger does not consider "gods" in a specific religious or theological framework. Rather, he topologically considers "immortals", as a path that through which human beings re-member [*andenken*] the "thought" of being. In other words, thinking *via* immortals help us in better approaching the issue of being. Thinking via immortals means, "remembering" a holy way of being in the world. As such, an understanding of the holy [*das Heilige*] as the Godhead is what is crucial. As the immortals are the messengers of the godhood (or holiness), the relation between the immortals and mortals come to the fore.[59]

According to Heidegger, the mortals and immortals are dwellers of distinct regions with regard to their different relations to mortality. The mortals are on the earth, while the abode of the immortals is the sky. It must be noted that, in German, the sky and the heaven are designated by the same word [*der Himmel*], as it is the case in French [*le Ciel*]. Other than the rather obvious fact that god and gods have been mythologically imagined to reside in the sky, the sky also indicates the space of void, emptiness, and indeterminacy. The sky remains in a direct and uninterrupted relationship with the earth, providing the entire horizon against which the earth itself can have a place and meaning.

Giving a brief definition of the immortals as divinities, Heidegger writes, "The divinities are the beckoning messengers of the godhead. Out of the holy sway of the

[59] Mitchell makes precisely the same point. Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*,164.

godhead, the god appears in his presence or withdraws into his concealment."[60] There are two implications of this: first, when Heidegger talks about the "Godhead", he does not talk about a particular god, but indicates something like the ontological essence of holiness, from which a sense of the divine emerges. Second, in talking about the concealment of immortals, Heidegger draws from Hölderlinian and Nietzschean representations of the divinities that have abandoned human beings. This is an idea that Heidegger issued mainly in his 1946 "Why Poets?" piece, dealing with Hölderlin's "Bread and Wine" elegy from 1801. Heidegger suggests:

> The default of God means that a God no longer gathers men and things to himself visibly and unmistakably and from this gathering ordains world-history and man's stay within it. However, in the default of God notice is given of something even worse. Not only have the gods and God fled, but the radiance of divinity is extinguished in world-history.[61]

Heidegger explains the same point in the same essay elsewhere in a topological way: "It is not only that the sacred is vanishing as the track to the godhead, but that even the tracks to this lost track are almost erased."[62] The topological element here is the way in which place is related to tracks and paths, which are also related to the notion of the "between". Insofar as paths are what "relates" places to one another, they can be associated with the notion of the between, and they are closely tied to the core of the notion of the medium that Mitchell brought forward. An important matter is that a profound understanding of "relation" requires a hermeneutic mode of thinking. Heidegger explicitly identifies the disaccord between immortals and mortals as an interruption of their "relation". What lacks is the "track" to the godhead: once the medium (the poet as the demigod) disappears, the

[60] Martin Heidegger, *Off the Beaten Track*, trans. and ed. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. (From here on*: Off the Beaten Track*)
[61] (*Off the Beaten Track*, 200)
[62] (*Off the Beaten Track*, 203)

bounding entity also becomes unidentifiable. What keeps things oriented and situated is "the between", and not things' fixed *locatedness* as present beings. As such, it is the dynamic nature of "the between", the "way" that provides the possibility of being situated, thus, the sense of place, as well as the possibility of being "related".

Acknowledging the limit of finitude is what allows us to have an ontological sense of dwelling. Insofar as there is the limit, we can have access to the "region" in which we exist. As such, the limit establishes the possibility of standing in a relation to another phenomenon or site of being and dwelling. This is where the question of the immortals and its relation to modern technology come to the focus. In a technological mode of dwelling in the world where things only appear as "useful" objects or instruments, the nature of our place in the world, especially in terms of our relation to things, becomes problematic. In his 1949 essay *The Thing*, Heidegger's discussion of the thing addresses the "shrinking of time and space" as a characteristic of modern technology.[63] The idea of fourfold develops out of a thinking that first and foremost considers the link between mortals and things in the world on the basis of the idea of being limited and conditioned by that which establishes our "finitude".

Wrathall, whose thinking on the relation between mortals and immortals is very relevant in this context, identifies the ways in which we are embedded in technological modes of understanding the meaning of our lives, and discusses how this leads to a loss of a sense of orientation in the world. There are two key topological suggestions that are related to our "place" in the world: 1) After bringing into view Nietzsche's announcement regarding the "death of God" in *The Gay Science*, Wrathall argues that the God has been the centre point according to which human beings determined their dwelling in the

[63] Martin Heidegger, *Poetry*, *Language*, *Thought*, trans. Albert Hoftstadter (New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2002), 163. (From here on, *Poetry, Language, Thought*)

world.[64] In the absence of the God, human beings no longer have an ontological or a moral reference point in terms of their orientation in the world. In other words, the death of the God meant the disappearance of the limit. In the course of his discussion, Wrathall brings into view an interesting topological remark from Heidegger concerning the essence of Nietzsche's thought. [65] Heidegger argues: "The thinking-through of Nietzsche's metaphysics becomes a reflection on the *situation* and *place* of contemporary man, whose destiny is still but little experienced with respect to its truth"[66]. Here Heidegger's words concerning the "situation" and "place" of human being are explicitly meant in a topological (onto-ethical) way. Neither "situation" nor "place" concerns the human beings, but rather it draws our attention to their dwelling in the world. For both Nietzsche and Heidegger, the death of God has significant consequences. With the death of God, the possibility of reconsidering our human situation in the world becomes possible, which urges us to inquire into the question of dwelling. Indeed, inasmuch as the death of God is ontologically a disorienting event, it is also an opening for a new interpretation of what it means to dwell as a human being, and our relation to the universe and the earth.

If the "situation" and "place" of contemporary man becomes a question on its own terms, and if for Heidegger the major reason for the "death of God" is only a consequence of what has already begun with Occidental metaphysics as the "forgetfulness of being" [*Seinsvergessenheit*], this means that for Heidegger the main question to be raised is the "relation" between being and human beings. 2) In relation to this idea, Wrathall suggests that immortals can be seen as what conditions and delimits the existence of human

[64] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 197.
[65] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History*, 198.
[66] Martin Heidegger, *Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1977), 54. (My emphasis) (From here on: *Question concerning Technology and Other Essays*)

beings.[67] Heidegger attempts to show the possibility of reappropriating our distance to the idea of the divine, thus, restoring our relation to it in the first place, instead of trying to produce new divinities, idols, and gods.

As I have shown, according to Heidegger's thought, we have lost the "way" that arrives at an understanding of the immortals. Wrathall also interprets this as a "loss of meaning" in the advent of technology. In a world where everything is perceived as resources, our relation to the world turns into a strict cause and effect relationship. As such, the world does not matter to us insofar as it does not quench our needs and aspirations. Wrathall concisely sums up Heidegger's insights: "we do not have things that matter to us if all there is is isolated, self-contained, interchangeable entities – in other words, resources"[68]. Furthermore, this is precisely why the poets are needed, as the poets are capable of understanding and interpreting the wider, yet the simpler range of relations and interrelations within which we already stand, seeing the earth and the sky and our place between them beyond mere utility. This is the context in which Wrathall takes distance from Dreyfus and Spinosa's reading of Heidegger[69]. Although Dreyfus and Spinosa positively try to find a way in which we could live peaceful lives in the technological age[70], Wrathall warns against the undesired conformism that may come along with such an attitude towards technology. It is important to know and experience the novelties of the technological age. However, modern technology can also uproot people from living existentially meaningful lives, and impose upon them a life of instrumentality, where their place in the world is entirely determined in terms of their instrumental

[67] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 219.
[68] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History*, 219.
[69] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 203.
[70] Hubert L. Dreyfus, Charles Spinosa, "Highway Bridges and Feasts: Heidegger and Borgmann on How to Affirm Technology", in *Heidegger Re-examined*, vol. 3, ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall (New York: Routledge, 2002), 175-193.

function in the society. In such a life, the earth and the sky, that between which existence takes place, may also lose their significance for human beings. Wrathall considers Dreyfus and Spinosa's proposal as a mere "contingency plan", which would not be desirable if we had the possibility to avoid it. If we could find a closer dwelling to the earth and the sky, this would be onto-ethically preferable, and the possibility of finding such a way of being must be the primary subject matter of our thinking.

According to Wrathall's reading of Heidegger, things with real meaning "makes a demand on us, and in the process, they condition us".[71] The term "real" here refers to existential significance, and is not used in contrast to the "ideal". The mutual conditioning indicates a two-way, reciprocal situation. This means, if something appears to be significant for us, it cannot be only us who has power over it, but the thing must also impose itself on us. For instance, if we claim that forests are significant, then, we must find ways of preserving forests and stop building residential sites in woodlands. We must focus on finding ways in which we could also adapt to our environmental conditions and contexts. This is a way of letting the trees matter for us, that is, a way of relating ourselves to the trees, which means a way of understanding and interpreting the place of trees for our existence. Modern technology supposedly turns such a relation of reciprocity into a one-way relation, where the technologically equipped human beings are the sole conditioners of the world, as they dominate it and the other beings in it without recognizing the experience of being "limited" and conditioned. As a result, they are not related to anything beyond themselves, thus they do not have a sense of place and orientation. Everything turns into mere supplies that human beings can modify, transform, replace, and dislodge in accordance with their plans, needs and wills. Instead of appropriating our "relation" to them and adapting to situations (such as weather, climate,

[71] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History*, 206.

geographical or geological characteristics of place), we identify them as problems to be resolved, and try to "fix" them in line with our needs, luxuries, and desires. As such, by refusing to acknowledge the conditions and circumstances of our situated essence, we flee the possibility of being appropriately attuned to the world, as the world itself turns into an object for us. In that sense, the technological understanding of the world means our objectification of the world by means of a technological mode of being in place. As we no longer conceive the place character of the earth, but only consider as an object to be used up and transformed, we deprive ourselves of the possibility of dwelling and the sense of being placed. This indicates the lack of a relation to that which is beyond human subjectivity, and where the "relation" lacks, our access to place, as well as the possibility of dwelling vanishes. Accordingly, technologically attuned human beings live a life of uprootedness, and Wrathall criticizes Dreyfus and Spinosa precisely in that regard, as this kind of an existence is precisely what stimulates Heidegger's later thinking commencing from the mid-1930s and 1940s.

In light of these remarks concerning the technological understanding of the world, the idea of the immortals, poetic dwelling, and the link to place becomes more apparent. The poet's situatedness in the between allows to "own" the situation in which it is possible to be conditioned and "appropriated" by that which makes a demand on the poet. Accordingly, one meaning of poetic dwelling appears to be openness and receptivity to the "other", which attunes the poet to the world, allowing the poetic subject to make sense of the world beyond the confines of egoistic subjectivism. The poet must –ideally– remain open to that which is beyond her or his egoistic wills or ambitions. As a consequence of her or his *situatedness* in the between, the poet must incorporate a sense of care for the site of dwelling in its wholeness, both near and far, that within which she or he is encompassed, bounded and conditioned. Therefore, the poet's situatedness in the between

is also what preserves and gathers the place in its entirety. Place indicates the site in which one's existential orientation in the world takes place. As such, the poet "lives" in the nearness of the immortals, insofar as the poet is the agent ready to be conditioned and delimited by the possibility of attaining a holy way of being in the world.[72]

The poet is the dweller of "the between": between the complete oblivion of mortality in the everyday and its complete absorption and incorporation in the dwelling of the immortals. On the one hand, the immortals are either deathless, or they have died in such a way that their death is no longer an issue. On the other hand, the people can exist with the oblivion of their mortality. For the poet, however, the question of mortality matters. In fact, it can only matter to the poet, because it is only the poet that is open to being conditioned and bounded. From a biological perspective, the poet is subject to the same conditions of impermanence as the non-poet. There are no biological differences in their respective "dying". Even if the poet may strive to be immortal, she or he biologically fails. However, the poet agent achieves to show forth the possibility of a certain relation to death that does not become manifest in the death of the non-poetic agent. The poet dwells in her or his "own" and "appropriated" and "conditioned" *topos*.

According to Heidegger, in the Occident is not the practice of religious faith that disappeared, but the very idea of a holy existence in the world. This is because, once the hermeneutic medium is lost, that is, the poetic experience of finitude, what the limit of finitude discloses and makes intelligible also becomes inaccessible. The profound critique of modernity that is at issue here underlines the necessity of standing in a poetic relation to the world: In our post-modern situation, however, it is possible that even the poets no

[72] Mitchell's noteworthy idea in that regard is as follows: "The mortal comes from death insofar as only in relating past itself is the mortal the mortal. This is simply another way for Heidegger to say that the limit is where something begins (something "coming here"). It begins from its relation beyond itself; it begins in its origin […] Its origin is precisely the medium around it through which it is allowed to be what it is. Death allows for mortality." Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 229.

longer experience what Wrathall calls "mutual conditioning". Once the poets no longer remain situated in the between to make sense of the inaccessibility to the Godhead, then, so remain the people disoriented. As such, a world beyond human wills and calculations also become non-imaginable. However, the poets are to preserve the "memory" and "rethinking" of the immortals. It is an ontological responsibility of the poet to remain open to the possibility of re-emergence of the experience of holiness. This does not mean that the poets must only poetize about gods and write poetry with religious themes. On the contrary, the poet can dwell in the everyday world in such a way that she or he can bring into the view the essence of holiness, which remains concealed for the people in their ordinary lives. By remaining in the openness to the Godhead, the poet can safeguard the possibility of a holy understanding of being in the world, which means poetically dwelling on the earth and under the sky. This is why the poet's dwelling is a "remembrance".

I. 4 Antigone: The Between of the People and the Immortals

Thus far I outlined the topological underpinnings of Heidegger's concentration on the notion of the between which will now help us in seeing more clearly what is at stake with Heidegger's interpretation of Sophocles' *Antigone* and Hölderlin's *The Ister*. In order to elucidate the *situatedness* of the poetic agent in the between and the role of *poeticality* in dwelling, I will examine the abovementioned 1942 lecture courses.

In the second division of *The Ister* lecture courses, Heidegger sets out to discuss the "onto-ethical" meaning of "home" and "homeliness" [*Heimlichkeit*] as concepts related to poetical dwelling. He undertakes this through an ontological analysis of Antigone's "actions". The question concerning the essence of Antigone's "character" is one of the first instances of Heidegger's discussion of *ethos* in relation to the link between

being and dwelling, ontology and ethics, which becomes an even more important point of focus in the "Letter on Humanism".[73]

According to Heidegger's interpretation, Antigone[74] is the "uncanniest of the uncanny",[75] which is also a characterization of the essence of the poetic agent. The discourse on the uncanny essence of Antigone's actions proves to be key with regards to the problem of poetic dwelling. [76] Antigone is the uncanniest of all mortals due to the specific relationship in which she stands to her own death and mortality.[77] Heidegger argues that the word *deinon* indicates three fundamental "situations" that co-constitute the ground of Antigone's actions. Accordingly, Antigone's actions are: (1) Fearful [*Furchtbar*] (2), Powerful [*Gewaltig*] and, (3) Inhabitual, in the sense of "wontless" or unfamiliar [*Ungewöhnlich*]. [78] Heidegger's interpretation of the Greek *deinon* as "*Unheimliche*", literally meaning "not homely, or home-like"[79] gathers together the manifold essence of Antigone's character and actions into a single word.[80] Heidegger's understanding of "translation" is as follows:

---

[73] Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism", in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 271.

[74] Let us briefly remember the plot of Sophocles' *Antigone*. The new king Creon of the Kingdom of Thebes takes over the throne from the old King Oedipus, as a consequence of a throne fight between two brothers, Eteocles and Polynices. The two brothers kill each other in the struggle hoping to become the new king. Creon commands that the dead body of Polynices should be left to rot in the open, outside of the city, without being buried. Antigone rises against this order and decides to bury her brother Polynices nevertheless, at the expense of breaking the law. Although she tries to convince her sister Ismene to join her in standing against the order of Creon, Ismene cannot defy the law and acts in accordance with the common sense showing loyalty to the law of the kingdom. As Antigone's burial of her brother becomes known, the tragic story of Antigone on her way to death begins. Although Ismene renounces her decision and apologetically wishes to be imprisoned with her sister, Antigone refuses. In the end, Antigone commits suicide.

[75] (*The Ister*, 51, 61-63)

[76] (*The Ister,* 64)

[77] (*The Ister*, 104)

[78] (*The Ister*, 63)

[79] Here, the English translation of Heidegger's interpretation of the word "uncanny" must be literally thought in relation to the original German word, which essentially means "un-homely".

[80] *Das Ungeheure,* "monstrous", is Hölderlin's own translation of Greek "*deinon*". Friedrich, Hölderlin, "Sophokles" in *Sämtliche Werke*, „Frankfurter Ausgabe, 16. Band, Edited by Michael Franz, Michael Knaupp und D.E. Sattler (Frankfurt am Main: Roter Stern, 1988), line: 349-352.

> Translating" [über-*setzen*] is not so much a "*trans*-lating" and passing over into a foreign language with the help of one's own. Rather translation is more an awakening, clarification and unfolding of one's own language with the help of an encounter with the foreign language." [81]

This means that every translation is a confrontation with one's own language, an adventure during the course of which one comes to "learn" the pathways of one's language by way of learning to hearken to the poetic word. Antigone's poetic "uncanniness" is related to her relation to mortality as the original dwelling place of human existence, which is revealed to us by the word *deinon*. [82] Yet, other than merely underlining the etymological meaning of the word, what does Heidegger understand by *deinon*? In *Introduction to Metaphysics* he specifies it: "*Dike* is the overwhelming fittingness. *Techne* is the violence-doing of knowing. The reciprocal relation between

---

Schmidt explains that in his translations Hölderlin's primary objective was to not appeal to "intelligibility", but to make German language imitate ancient Greek even at the expense of alienating German language in order to attend the so-called oriental and eccentric attitude of Greece and the Greek language. The fact that Hölderlin attempted to go beyond a mere linguistic listening in his translations may be one of the reasons why and how Heidegger has come to see the issue of language beyond merely linguistic terms and concerns. Dennis Schmidt J., *On Germans and Other Greeks*: *Tragedy and Ethical Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 143-144. Also concerning the issue of the translation and interpretation of "*deinon*" see the pages 145 and 246 in Schmidt's work.

[81] (*The Ister,* 65-66) Indeed, this also means that translation can be a violent and dangerous gesture, for not only it displaces the original language that from which one translates, but even more, so it risks going beyond one's already established own language which, in this way, is displaced from its habitual and ordinary place. Hölderlin and Heidegger, in that sense, have similar understandings and practices of "translation".

[82] In *Introduction to Metaphysics* Heidegger explains the sense in which *deinon* should be understood as "*Unheimliche*", namely, uncanny. Although the sense of "terrifying" is significant, he rather wants to draw attention to the topological sense of the word, indicating why and how it is related to the issue of dwelling when he claims: "But human beings are the uncanniest, not only because they spend their lives essentially in the midst of the un-canny understood in this sense, but also because they step out, move out of the limits that at first and for the most part accustomed and homely, because as those who do violence, they overstep the limits of the homely, precisely in the direction of the uncanny in the sense of the overwhelming." Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Frien and Richard Polt. (New Haven& London: Yale University Press, 2000), 161.

them is the happening of uncanniness."[83] Like Hölderlin, Heidegger attempts to bring the issue into view in terms of one's relation to one's being as a mortal, which, situates the major concern of his discussions within the dimension of mortality, in specific in terms of the dialogue between mortals and immortals. The "justice" is the "fittingness" of one's situation in the taking place of being, which is mediated by one's relation to finitude, and "*techne*" is one's poetic "knowledge" of one's place within the boundaries of that bounded openness.

First of all, as Antigone goes to bury her brother, her kinship with the dead ones comes to fore as a striking feature of her character. Antigone says:

> And if I have to die for this pure crime/ I am content, for I shall rest beside him/ His love will answer mine/ I have to please The dead far longer than/ I need to please The living /with them, I have to *dwell* forever.[84]

Antigone's words above draw our attention to consider the link between "being" and "action". If an action is a certain manner of relating oneself to the overall situation in which one finds oneself and responding to it, this means that "being" and "action" do not stand in a dualistic relation. Antigone perceives the situation in which she finds herself as an opening to become who she already is. In other words, the situation offers her a way of enacting her true "character". This is the sense in which Antigone's dwelling through her decisions has an "onto-ethical" nature, where she comes to define her "being" through the way in which she "acts". Antigone's being and actions are "onto-ethical" in the sense that they bespeak Antigone's "character".

There is a tendency in Heidegger scholarship to concentrate on the moral and

[83]Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Frien and Richard Polt. (New Haven& London: Yale University Press, 2000), 176. It must be noticed that Heidegger translates *dike* (traditionally translated as "justice") as "fittingness" [*Fug*] and *techne* (traditionally translated as "art") as "knowing" [*Wissen*]. In effect, Heidegger's translation of *dike* as *Fug* is suggestive of the way in which he attempts to do away with what he calls a juridical and moralist understanding of justice. He argues later on: "Being, *physis*, is, as sway, originary gatheredness. Being is fittingness that enjoins: *dike*.

[84] (*Antigone*, line: 71–75.)

political aspects of Antigone's decision. This is because her actions are considered as a way of fulfilling her civic identity, moral personality and such, but, surprisingly, not so much with regards to her very ontological being and the place of her dwelling. One example is Kathleen Wright's interpretation of Heidegger, which she conceptualizes under the title of "forgetfulness of the ethical difference".[85] In comparing Hegel's Antigone with Heidegger's interpretation, her main argument is based on the following idea: Heidegger's oblivion of the sexual difference, as well as the prioritization of *deinon* over *dike*, leads Heidegger to produce a conflicting reading with Hegel's reading. This results in the contrast between "ethical difference between family law and state law" and "ontological difference between poetic dwelling on the earth and the technical mastery of the world".[86] According to Wright, Hegel gets it right by proposing that the conflict between the obligations to family and state are the most foundational sources of ethical conflicts: Heidegger's thought is oblivious of the sexual difference that cannot be separated from the character of Antigone. As such, Wright contends, Heidegger cannot address the question of the *ethics*. One question that appears in response to Wright's interpretation is the following one: how can we distinguish between an ethical and ontological decision? In other words, at which point can one's action be characterized as ontological (that which concerns one's being) or ethical (that which concerns one's moral character)?

First of all, there are different understandings of the "ethical" that are at issue here, which is the major difference in Wright and Heidegger's respective readings. Véronique Foti deliberately recognizes this point as she defends the Hölderlinian paradigm, which, as she argues, is followed by Nietzsche and Heidegger against the Hegelian understanding of

[85] I contend that putting the matters in terms of the forgetfulness of the ethical difference appears to be a narrow reading of Heidegger's thought in its unity. See: Kathleen Wright, "Heidegger on Hegel's Antigone", in *Endings: Questions of memory in Hegel and Heidegger*, ed. Rebecca Comay and John McCumber (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999), 170.
[86] Kathleen Wright, "Heidegger on Hegel's Antigone", in *Endings: Questions of memory in Hegel and Heidegger*, ed. Rebecca Comay and John McCumber, 173.

tragedy in terms of "ethicality" as *Sitthlichkeit* and "self-realization of Spirit.[87] Whereas Hegel's understanding of "ethicality" involves the subject-related tension between law and history especially on the grounds of kinship and the shift from matriarchal society to patriarchal society, in the Hölderlinian paradigm it becomes a matter of the onto-ethical "situation" and "correspondence" *between* mortals and immortals. As I will discuss, Heidegger wants to show that the "ethical" cannot be detached from the issue of "dwelling" –yet beyond nationalistic, subjectivistic and historiographical frames – as well as being itself cannot be separated from "deed".[88] In other words, when we look into the issue topologically by thinking via the notion of dwelling, our thinking incorporates both "ontology" and "ethics" in a hermeneutic way that invites us to examine the link between being, language and place. In that context, I argue that Heidegger's reading of *Antigone* embarks on closing the gap between the so-called ontological and the ethical difference in putting forward a new interpretation that seeks to go beyond the limits of "being-action" dichotomy. [89]

Antigone's becoming homely in the counter movement against the laws of the *polis* is a movement in which she is directed to find her dwelling place, as well as her true *ethos*, in performing the unfamiliar action. Antigone's action is a great source of awe for the common sense that is represented by the chorus.[90] According to Heidegger, the chorus

[87] Véronique Foti, *Epochal Discordance: Hölderlin's Philosophy of Tragedy* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2006), 14.

[88] Capobianco's discussion of Heidegger's Antigone is worthwhile in pointing out the similarities and nuances comparing the 1942 *Ister* lectures with the 1935 *Introduction to Metaphysics*. His reading also encompasses the notion of "being at home", while dealing with Heidegger's texts spanning from mid–1920s until 1960s. See: Richard Capobianco, *Engaging Heidegger* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 55–65.

[89]Nikolopoulou offers a thought-provoking reading that favours an ontological interpretation of Antigone, which thematizes the problem of poetic dwelling. Nikolopoulou suggests that Antigone's decision is one that was already taken –almost even before the play commences. Kalliopi Nikolopoulou, *Tragically Speaking: On the Use and Abuse of Theory for Life* (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), xxxix.

[90] This is also related to the fact that, as I will explicate further, Antigone has the poetic *ethos* in that she has the capacity to "dare" [*tolma*] in her violent uncanniness. She is the *creative*, that is,

represents the common sense of the everydayness by embodying the moral norms of the city. Antigone's action has an overwhelming weight, which manifests the absorption of Ismene's being in the everydayness, where her actions are altogether defined by the dwelling of the people. Ismene's being belongs to the people of the *polis*, while Antigone's being belongs to the limit between mortals and immortals. Antigone takes the risk of her being un-settled by leaving the boundaries of the "homely", and yet only in doing so, she achieves to be *at home* in her own being. Antigone's deed separates her from the realm of common sense, and thus, everydayness.[91] Accordingly, in ethical terms, such deed would be called "transgression of the conventional *limits*". This means that being able to go beyond the limits of the ordinary indicates one's resoluteness for a dwelling that has a horizon. In the following lines, Antigone voices her inner state of being in the face of death:

> Unfortunate that I am— Neither living among those who are alive, nor Dwelling as a corpse. Among corpses, having no home with either the living or the dead.[92]

Antigone knows that she can neither dwell with the alive nor with the dead. This places her in the between. The fact that Antigone is deprived of any possibility of being–at–home is one of the aspects that Heidegger pays attention to in Sophocles' tragedy. The core matter of Heidegger's argument is that Antigone is completely at home in not being-at-home, which is not the case for Ismene. Antigone's unsettledness in *polis* also unsettles Ismene's ordinary being-there. Where Antigone's tragedy comes to end, Ismene's

---

the *poetic* one, who sets out into the "un-said", "who breaks out into the un-thought". Martin Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Frien and Richard Polt. (New Haven& London: Yale University Press, 2000), 172.

[91] Related to this issue, Capobianco indicates the similarities between Lacan and Heidegger's view of Antigone and he uses the word transgression [*Überstreitung*] in describing the onto-ethical movement of the poetic agent from the habitual to the inhabitual, from the settledness towards the unsettling.

[92] (*Antigone*, Line: 909-913)

commences, for now Antigone's uncanniness gets transferred to Ismene, yet Ismene does not even have the possibility to die her own death. She is condemned to eternally die Antigone's death; yet, this opportunity is also taken away from her, again, eternally. As such, what Antigone achieves at once, to die her own death, is precisely what Ismene fails to seize.

From the very outset, Antigone acts in accordance with what she "ought" to do on the basis of her very "being", and she is not capable of acting differently by any means.[93] Antigone's decision is not more terrifying (unsettling) or overwhelming than it actually and already is because she is a woman. The issue that she deals with, namely, the question of human mortality (that of Polynices' and consequently her own), is that which de-limits her "existence", that is, her being exposed to death. The "decision" is to dwell with the dead, which is an acknowledgment of and a confrontation with her mortality. As a result, Antigone's confrontation with the living (in siding with the dead against time) is what constitutes the "onto-ethical" significance of her decision, and not her going against the law of the city. Antigone's action indeed has social and political consequences, but her character is profoundly pre-political[94]. This is why in her interpretation, Wright seems to underestimate the fact that Heidegger's primary concern is first and foremost human being's liminal situation vis-à-vis death, from which all both ontological and ethical questions emerge, much before the conflict with the state and the family may arise as subjectivistic concerns. Her *ethos*, in the sense of her way of dwelling, drives Antigone's

[93] Bernard M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Los Angeles & Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 62.

[94] This is also the sense in which Nikolopoulou raises her concerns regarding a narrowly framed feminist reading of Antigone:
"Given that Butler's interest in the play stems from her interest in an antistatist kind of feminism as opposed to a recent wave of feminism that seeks "the backing and authority of the state to implement feminist policy aims" (1), I find that Antigone's prepolitical (or antipolitical) character may be more relevant to her argument than the politics of social construction." Kalliopi Nikolopoulou, *Tragically Speaking: On the Use and Abuse of Theory for Life* (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 178.

actions. This point is related to the fact that in Heidegger's thought there is no conflict between "being" and "*praxis*", but on the contrary, insofar as one's response to the situation in which one finds oneself is the outcome of an onto-ethical "responsibility", being and acting, "is" and "ought", stand in a close and reciprocal relationship.

Thanks to her *ethos*, Antigone accomplishes what Ismene is even afraid to imagine. Antigone's burial of Polynices breaks the law of the city, and locates Antigone's *ethos* far beyond of what is acknowledged as customary and habitual. In the act of burying Polynices, she is in a complete state of seclusion, even abandoned by Ismene. In performing such an action that no one else in the kingdom of Thebes dares, she prefers homelessness to rootlessness, her own death to a life whose consequences she would not be able bear.[95] In choosing to act in this way, Antigone not only chooses authenticity over inauthenticity, but also turns towards immortality, showing the limits of mortality that she encounters. As such, we find Antigone, as the demigod, placed between the people and the immortals.

Following a similar line of thinking to Heidegger, Lacan suggests: "This then is how the enigma of Antigone is presented to us: she is inhuman". [96] Insofar as being poetic means to situate oneself in "the between", her dwelling is a poetic one, for only through her *ethos* the being of the immortals and the people become manifest within the same horizon of understanding. In experiencing the limit of mortality and immortality, her dwelling discloses both regions as two conflicting modes of relating to existence. As Antigone decides not to remain within the boundaries of an everyday understanding of the law, she encounters her envisioned "dwelling-place" in the city, but she ventures beyond

[95] Here we should pay attention to the German word "inhabitual" that Heidegger here uses. "Ungewöhnlich", derives from the verb of *wohnen*, which means to dwell, live. English language has the same word "wont", also in the adverb form of "wontedly", which means "in accordance with the conventions and tradition.

[96] Jacques Lacan, *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, ed. Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. Dennis Porter (New York: Norton, 1992), 263.

these limits at the expense of losing her mortality, which, in turn, allows her to attract the appraisal of the gods.[97] " According to Knox, there are certain religious underpinnings of Antigone's actions. For instance, she has a very strong and pious relation to the gods of the underworld and her reverence for the gods go beyond the *polis*.[98] As can be seen, here Antigone's "place", or what we might also call her situatedness, is not her physical location in a geo-political location or dimension, but the way in which she positions her being: the way in which she dwells in situating herself in the between.

In siding with the commonplace moral values of the *polis*, Ismene chooses to dwell with the divine law, yet her over proximity to the *polis* annihilates, and further distances her from divinity, whereas Antigone attracts the divine praise. Ismene's dwelling is too habitual (homely) to become inhabitual (unhomely), that is, to encounter the liminal space between mortality and immortality, whereas Antigone is extremely inhabitual to the extent that her dwelling is a direct encountering of that very limit. Antigone's existential transgression of the limits of mortality indicates a way of moving beyond the region of everydayness (dwelling region of people) towards the inhabitual region (dwelling region of gods). It is an essential confrontation with time (the temporal region of mortality), just as a confrontation with the earth (the spatial region of mortality). Antigone performs what we can call proto-hermeneutics by the very way in which she comports herself as the interpreter of the most unsettling aspect of life, namely death. This does not mean that Antigone's dwelling exemplifies some sort of 'poetic hermeneutics', but rather the way in which her dwelling enacts hermeneutics is a poetic engagement. In turn, the hermeneutic

[97] Nikolopoulou argues: "It is they, in fact, who glorify her fate as being equal to the gods', and their earlier praise of Antigone's destiny has even implied that Antigone's predicament surpasses Niobe's in that the former consciously chose the moral high road whereas the latter committed hubris unthinkingly: "Yes, you go to the place where the dead are hidden, / but you go with distinction and praise" (lines 878–79)". Kalliopi Nikolopoulou, *Tragically Speaking: On the Use and Abuse of Theory for Life* (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 15.
[98] Bernard M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Los Angeles & Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 98.

nature of "the between" that is at issue is topological, insofar as it is related to the situatedness of the dwelling place of Antigone. The source of her "onto-ethical" transgression is her heroic temper, which according to Knox has two characteristics: 1) *autonomos*: "a law unto itself", 2) *autognotos orga*: "passion self-conceived". He describes this as a result of her *physis* as her being and character: "it is not to be explained by outside circumstances".[99] She directs those two characteristics of her being to her comportment towards death, which allows her to transgress the political boundaries of the *polis*.

After having explicating the ontological aspect of Antigone's action, Bernard Knox also considers the political (and also the religious) register of Antigone's action. Indeed, Antigone stands in a fierce opposition to Creon, and if he is the head of the *polis*, then, Antigone's defiance of the law appears as a political action. Now, Knox considers the *polis* in the customary sense of the word as the city-state, or simply the state as the subject of the power. While Ismene submits to that power, which according to Creon represents the authority of the law and the civilization, Antigone goes against it by her extreme loyalty to the blood relationship, a loyalty that is normally expected to be shown for *polis*.[100] On the other hand, Heidegger's interpretation of Antigone attempts to shift the focus from a subjectivistic understanding of community to an "onto-ethical" understanding of being there and dwelling-place in reading Sophocles *via* Hölderlin. In order to comprehend the essence of *polis*, we need to concentrate on place, insofar as Heidegger understands it as the place that gathers one's relation to things. This should also help us in clarifying further the way in which place and poetry are linked.

---

[99] Bernard M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Los Angeles & Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 67.
[100] Bernard M. W. Knox, *The Heroic Temper: Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy* (Los Angeles & Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 76.

I. 5 The Ister: The Journeying of the Place and the Place of Journeying

The topological examination of Heidegger's interpretation of Antigone's dwelling showed us the poetic sense of the between, especially regarding the relation between mortals and immortals, but also between the earth and the sky. It turned out that one of the significant designations of the dwelling-place is *polis*; however, Heidegger understands the term in its pre-political sense. Now let us focus on the possibility of a pre-political and poetic understanding of place as such.

Polis is a key concept in *The Ister* lectures in many respects. Considering the fact that the lecture courses were given at a time when Greece was under Nazi occupation, it is unrealistic to think that Heidegger did not consider the historical relation between Antigone and Hölderlin, ancient Greece and Germany. Yet, for later Heidegger, nations are the geo-political and subjectivistic representations of the actual homeland, *heimat,* as one's belonging place. The onto-ethical *heimat* of human existence is death.[101] This is why Heidegger attempts to show forth the pre-political implications of *polis*. He argues: "If "the political" is that which belongs to the *polis* and therefore is essentially dependent upon the *polis*, then the essence of the *polis* can never be determined in terms of the political, just as the ground can never be explained or derived from the consequence."[102] So, what does the *polis* amount to? According to Heidegger, the *polis* is founded upon the "truth of being" (*aletheia*) and refers to the *site* [*Ort*] in which all beings and all relational comportment toward beings is gathered.[103] The *polis* is where the people build political establishments because it is the onto-ethical site of dwelling that gathers their relations to

[101] The historical relationship between Greece and Germany must also be seen in this context: Ancient Greece is the "beginning" of philosophy, while Germany is the "end". The so-called historical relationship between them is thus not a "historiographical", "cultural", "geopolitical" or "inter-national" affinity. It is solely on the grounds of the "onto-historical" happening and destiny of thinking itself.
[102] (*The Ister*, 85)
[103] (*The Ister*, 86)

the world. So to say, the *polis* is where they are born, where they have their families, occupations, interests, desires and projections. But it is not as if these "human ventures and procedures" [*poros*] determines the *polis*. Rather, it is the place as *Ort,* and specifically the happening of place that brings and gathers people together. In other words, *polis* is where human "situation" takes place. This is the meaning of *polis* as being "in the midst of beings in such a way that they comport themselves toward beings as such."[104] Political and moral registers of thought remain only derivative of this relation to the "open", and this is why the holy remains closed off to them.[105] As such, in order to properly understand *polis* appears, we must first consider our relation to *physis*. It is in that sense, the river Ister and the onto-ethical meaning of its flowing activity becomes an issue, which interrelates the poetic dwelling of Antigone with the Hölderlin's Ister: Both Antigone and Ister are of *physis*, and both are representative of modes of dwelling that invite us to think the happening of being itself as the very emergence of the nature. Only doing this would allow us to have a holy sense of being and dwelling in the world by letting ourselves be conditioned and bound by that which is beyond human.

As Mitchell also points out, Heidegger understands the holy as that which is liberated from utility as *Uneigennützige*.[106] A topological mode of thinking can help us to elucidate what is at issue here. If the holy liberates one from the confines of everydayness, it is because it allows us to see things not as mere objects to be used, but as things to be encountered, as things with which one can dwell. As such, it brings the human being into the openness of an understanding of being. It does so by not letting the human being be encircled in the hustle and bustle of everydayness, and the openness of being is found

[104] (*The Ister*, 89)
[105] In Heidegger scholarship, Young also understands the meaning of *polis* as pre-political. See: Julian Young, "Poets and Rivers: Heidegger on Hölderlin's 'Der Ister'", in *Heidegger Re-examined*, vol. 3, ed. Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall (New York: Routledge, 2002), 79, 84.
[106] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 191.

precisely at that *topos* where the human existence is not constrained inside, but rather liberated into the open. "The open" is where the experience of the holy comes to take place. In other words, it is the holy essence of the medium that mediates the mortals and immortals, the earth and the sky, and essentially, being and human beings *via* "the between".

As such, for Heidegger, a holy relation to *polis* is only possible on the grounds of *poiesis* that speaks of *physis*, because it is poetry as the essence of any activity of "making" which reveals the world to us so that we can "build" on the earth [*Erde*], which also means under the heavens (sky) [*Himmel*]. Essentially, *polis* is the place of the "fourfold", because it is where human beings see the possibility of dwelling and building. This is why the matter is taken up through Hölderlin's hymn[107], where the question at issue is the "poetic dwelling", and not "political dwelling". The dwelling that is at stake can only originate from the "open", as the place of being in which it opens itself up to human beings. Heidegger claims, "Only because human beings can say "it is" can they also say " I am," and not vice versa. And it is because human beings can say, "is." As they "have" a relation to being, they are able to "say" and they can "have" the word, thus, they are *zoon logon echon*."[108] In turn, when the mortals stand in a relation to being, they also make this relation explicit poetically. Mitchell argues:

> The poet speaks in a way that allows the words their widest reach. Poetic language is understood here to reverberate with ambiguities and variant meanings, to form connections with other words, other thoughts, and other things through the relations it unfolds and the relations it allows. The poetic word is born from a sacrifice of linguistic utility along with the relations that utility privileges and prescribes (clarity, univocity).[109]

[107] (*The Ister*, 1)
[108] (*The Ister*, 90)
[109] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 196.

What this means is that *via* the holy, one finds a deeper relation to the world *via* language, just as it means that *via* language, one finds a new relation to the holy, which, in turn, is the medium between the mortals and the immortals.

Heidegger finds the poetic "between" he captured in Antigone's dwelling also in the flowing activity of the river in the hymn "The Ister"[110], which directs our attention to the topological underpinnings of the relation between dwelling and place. In the first division of the lecture courses, Heidegger focuses on the interpretation of Hölderlin's hymn. The Ister, which is a derivation of the Greek name *Istros,* is the Latin word for the river Danube.[111] Heidegger closely investigates the poetic meaning of the rivers Rhine and Danube [*Ister*] that spring from the German homeland and flow in different directions. From this geographic-historical context, Heidegger derives different modes of dwelling which can be associated with the respective dwelling of Ismene and Antigone.[112]

Heidegger's most important conceptual discussions in *The Ister* lectures are often omitted in the contemporary scholarship, which also results in the negligence regarding the profoundly topological framework of the lecture courses. Heidegger's major idea of dwelling in *The Ister* lecture courses is based on his criticism of calculative and technological understanding of temporality and spatiality. This issue is important, as it is something that impacts our relation to things, which later becomes a discussion on its own

[110] The river Ister springs from the town Donauschingen in the Black Forest region in Germany and runs its course toward the Black Sea, into which it discharges by passing through historical ancient Greek sites in today's Romania.

[111] The ancient and modern history of the river Danube departing from Heidegger's *Der Ister* lecture course has been very well documented in the 2004 experimental philosophical documentary of Daniel Ross and David Barison.

[112] The historical and geographical significance of those rivers at issue should be acknowledged. Hölderlin wrote: "Und warum hängt er / An den Bergen gerad? / Der andre Der Rhein ist seitwärts Hinwegegangen." Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlins Hymne*: *Der Ister* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1984), 4 (GA 53).
Here Hölderlin hints that Rhein abandoned the task of going to the "source", whereas the river Danube accomplishes it: it springs from the Black Forest region in Germany, and by passing through number of countries, including the historical Ancient Greek regions, discharges into the Black Sea.

terms in the 1949 *The Thing* essay. Heidegger's critique is not against natural sciences and their mathematical methods of understanding time and space, but rather against the reductive view that only a representational mode of thinking can provide us with a profound understanding of space, time and place.

In order to emphasize the flowing activity of the river, Heidegger proposes a new pair of terms, which invites us to reconsider the relation between space, place and time. "Locality (or abode) and journeying", [*Ortschaft und Wanderschaft*][113], which represent the poetic dimension of the relation between space, place and time, shifts our focus to the necessity of thinking the journeying experience of being in place, as well as being placed in the happening of time. Heidegger argues, "the abode is a whiling. It needs a while. In such a whiling human beings find rest."[114] The temporal occurrence of the river is essentially a whiling in place. This is because whiling requires a dwelling place, and without place, no dwelling or whiling can come to occur. Therefore the primary experience of space and time are grounded in being situated in the action of dwelling. In order to understand how dwelling grounds the taking place of space and time, we must first consider the dynamic essence of journeying as unfolding and happening, a point that is particularly related to the notion of event [*Ereignis*] as we will see.

The rivers have obvious geographical or anthropological significances. For instance, most human settling historically took place in regions that are close to rivers. In the course of its journeying, the rivers shape and nurture the land. Once they originate from their sources, they are in the course of flowing into far away lands, leaving behind the place from which they originate. When thought from a human perspective, it is only by abandoning the home as the origin that the rivers become homely. In other words, this is how rivers disclose what belongs to themselves as their own.

[113] (*The Ister*, 39)
[114] (*The Ister*, 20)

The continuous tension between the origin and the end, the source and the opening, the near and the far, belongs to the very event of the rivers. Yet, these different "ends" do not appear as opposing binaries, but as that which constitute a unity and a singularity, provided by the "movement" of the flowing activity. The river shows forth the "between" and the "medium". Because of that, Mitchell argues that thinking the river also means to think the meaning of interrelationality[115]. With a poetic reflection on the *ethos* of rivers, it is possible to show that the meaning of "journeying" (as the poetic essence of temporality) does not have to be attributed to the origin, but it becomes meaningful in the journeying from the origin to the opening, from past to the future. In a certain ontological sense, this is how anything becomes what it is insofar in its unfolding. This is also the case for mortal human existence: we are thrown into certain situations and environments, yet these historical conditions and circumstance project us into the future. The past has never really passed, just as the future is not something that will arrive at sometime beyond this moment. The past as that which delimits my present now is constantly flowing into the future as that which remains open and that towards which I move. This is the meaning of "presencing" in the sense of things' unfolding and coming to appear from place, from a particular openness.[116] With this view, Heidegger wishes to establish the sense of "journeying" as the true source of the meaning of "temporality". With this characterization of the concept, another crucial element with regards to the dwelling of the river comes to the fore. The water's ongoing flowing activity from the origin to the mouth of the river makes manifest the relation between existence and death.

According to Heidegger, in order to be able to confront the unsettling character of the nearest, one has to depart from the "home" (origin) and learn to inhabit the "foreign",

[115] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 96.
[116] This is also the meaning of *aletheia* as the truth or disclosure of being with regards to human Dasein.

and in order to be able to make sense of the "home". In other words, we have to think "death", in order to be able to appropriately think "existence" and ask concerning the meaning of being (in the world). Before *The Ister* lectures, for instance, in the *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, Heidegger closely engaged with the interpretation of Hölderlin's poem "Homecoming/ To the Kindred Ones" [*Heimkunft/ An die Verwandten*][117]. It is possible to observe that Heidegger finds considerable philosophical material for his own thinking when he considers the notion of "homecoming", which is one of the most common subjects for the ancient Greek poetry and tragedy as well.[118] This is also the main theme of Hölderlin's novel *The Hyperion*[119], an idea that Hölderlin himself poetically narrates at length. That being said, it is important to note that Heidegger elucidates the notion of homecoming from an "onto-ethical" perspective, dealing with the homecoming of human existence in relation to the question of journeying and dwelling. In other words, Heidegger does not concern himself with the "homecoming" of an individual in geo-spatial terms, but his thinking proceeds in a much broader context. His thinking shows a way in which we could reorient our understanding of the relationship between death and our mortality. The poet learns from the river precisely this: namely, how to

[117] Martin Heidegger, *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry,* trans. Keith Hoeller (New York: Humanity Books, 2000), 26.

[118] *The Nostoi* and Homer's *Odyssey* are two of the most significant examples of this common theme for Greeks.

[119] "*Bellarmin* is the name of the companion with whom *Hyperion* once engaged in a long conversation in the course of many letters, which tell stories of *days of love* and *deeds.* Hyperion is the name of the poet. He himself is *the* companion about whose whereabouts the question inquires. But where he himself is the poet must certainly know, especially now, because, as the greeting one, he lets himself be known as the one who stays behind in his homeland. But the poet first asks about Bellarmin *with* his companion. Are we to suppose his companion is still with him? Or are we to assume that the two are separated? Where are the friends? This question does not want to locate the friends' whereabouts geographically. It thinks the essence of the place to whose location each of the friends has now been destined. For in the meantime, since the poetic period of Hölderlin's novel *Hyperion,* the poet has experienced other things. In the drama *Empedocles* the friend is no longer Bellarmin's companion. He has journeyed to another essential place. But even this place has been left behind in the interval. The *Empedocles* still belongs to the journey. *Homecoming* begins only where *The Wanderer* has crossed over to the poetic saying about the homeland's rivers ("The Rhine" and "The Ister")". Martin Heidegger, *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry,* trans. Keith Hoeller (New York: Humanity Books, 2000), 150.

think the relationship between birth, existence, and death; the presence and absence; journeying in time and place, while attempting to understand how to dwell poetically. Approaching the streaming of the river situates us within the boundaries of a poetic mode of thinking.

Heidegger's claims concerning the relationship between the "near" and the "distant" are central to his main argument. With this, Heidegger also makes use of the phenomenological law of proximity. Accordingly, the things that are near remain distant from our immediate attention. Just as when we stand too close to an object, we cannot have a perspective that will capture the object in full detail. Our over-proximity requires us to take a step back, or change focus, in order to see the object from a better perspective. This is the same when it comes to our relation to death. Death as our no-longer-being-there-in-the-world stands too near as an event, therefore thinking the meaning of death requires a change of focus regarding our situation in existence. Oddly enough, one has to exist to learn death while existing, and yet, one also has to "die", in order to question the meaning of "being" in its entirety, while this is precisely where existence (our situatedness in asking the question of being) disappears. In this context, one of the outstanding lines in Hölderlin's hymn reads:

> Not without wings may/Someone grasp at what is nearest Directly/ And reach the other side.[120]

Accordingly, the river has wings. Under a certain light, this indicates the immediate relationship between the sky and the earth: with wings one flies. In this case, it is the river that may reach the other side. The other side is also the nearest. The double meaning here that is at issue concerns the way in which one has to incorporate one's existence as a

[120] (*The Ister*, 4)

mortal, through experiencing the constant journeying of one's death from the future toward the presence. The presence is the nearest and therefore it always disappears in sight and is only understandable as something to be remembered of the past, or, as something to be accomplished, projected into the future. In that sense, there are two simultaneous motions taking place "between" the past and the future (the origin and the end) that co-constitute a two-way counter-movement: I exist, moving from my past toward my future, yet my future, whose limits are delimited by my death, is simultaneously running toward me. The middle space between my past and my future is where the spatiotemporal essence of my existence as "presencing" takes place, where I find myself as an existing being. Indeed, the counter movement that is at stake highlights this manifold process of folding and unfolding. While the past is folding into the future, the future is simultaneously unfolding into the past. The between, which discloses the presence as presencing is the event [*Ereignis*] in place as journeying.

In the following passage, Heidegger gives a very concise summary of his *Ister* lecture courses on the relationship between the home and abroad, one's own and the foreign, which needs to be carefully considered in an onto-ethical register:

> Yet that which is their own often remains foreign to human beings for a long time, because they abandon it without having appropriated it. And human beings abandon what is their own because it is what most threatens to overwhelm them. One's own is least of all something that produces itself of its own accord […] In that case, however, to dwell in what is one's own is what comes last and is seldom successful and always remains what is most difficult. Yet if the river determines the locality of the homely, then it is of essential assistance in becoming homely [*Heimischwerden*] in what is one's own[121].

In light of this passage, we can say that Heidegger's *Ister* lecture courses are founded upon the following thought: In order to be able to dwell, one needs to reinhabit one's own,

[121] (*The Ister*, 21)

which always remains the nearest and the most difficult to appropriate, precisely because of this utmost proximity. This is what distinguishes the poet from the non-poet: while the poet journeys the limits of presencing, the non-poet gets lost in the proximity of the limit, in fleeing it. The poet ontologically appropriates her or his dwelling place, in the sense that she or he constantly journeys through the limit, which allows her or him to inhabit two respective dimensions that are opened up by and at the *limit*. The non-poet remains in the midst of things, always exposed to this nearness, never being able to making his dwelling place her or his own, thus remaining distant to it, stuck in sheer presence. Spatial proximity does not mean existential nearness. The nearness must be seen as the place where journeying takes place so that our relation to it can continue to unfold.

As I have stated, according to Heidegger the poet learns the capacity to appropriate and be appropriated by what is near from the flowing activity of the river. Nikolopoulou astutely describes what is at stake regarding the relationship between the flowing of rivers and the streaming of human existence in the direction of death:

> Hölderlin produces yet another paratactic identification, at least as fraught as he thinks the previous one: describing the human desire for death, which becomes intensified in moments of extreme danger, the poet compares it to a natural phenomenon — namely, to the rivers that impulsively seek rest in the ocean. This comparison does not stop at the level of metaphorical resemblance but runs deeper in order to reveal nature as the unreflexive, blind structure of some human acts. Through a catachrestic use of personification, Hölderlin not only likens but actually equates the way in which rivers — against their wish (wider Willen) — rush seaward following the sacred call and the way in which human beings unthinkingly — with no sense of self-reflection (selbstvergessen) — follow blindly a shortcut (die kürzeste Bahn) to their destruction, overtaken by holy fire in the form of a death wish (Todeslust). The human becomes one with nature, as both act with no reference to reason.[122]

For Heidegger, Ister's discharge into the Black Sea in its counter-flow from the

[122] Kalliopi Nikolopoulou, *Tragically Speaking: On the Use and Abuse of Theory for Life* (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012), 210.

"homeland" and Antigone's "movement" against the *polis* signify the two-fold onto-ethical nature of homecoming. In that regard, Mitchell also underscores the relationship between the river and the sea. Drawing on Heidegger's 1934 lecture courses, Mitchell suggests, "the source and the mouth are nothing other than the river itself […] the sea itself *is* the source at its most distant remove".[123] The focus here is on the streaming activity of the river, yet the sea itself gets embodied in the *topos* of this flowing activity, as the source meets the sea. The rivers show forth the same poetic *ethos* of the between insofar as they stream.

Seeing the issue against this background can bring into view the way in which Antigone decided to run against the law of the city. The river Ister can be associated with Antigone, while the Rhein can be linked with Ismene. Antigone is the between (of the mortals and immortals, earth and sky), which forces her to move outside of the limits of the *polis*. In contrast, Ismene remains inside the "presence", submitting to the law of the *polis*. In other words, Antigone and Ismene's dwelling look to completely different directions. Antigone's dwelling, which is a being on the way towards death, becomes the source of her longing for immortality instead of living without honour. This is the core of Antigone's tragedy, which annihilates her: the obstinate will to be near to gods, a complete denial of the *polis*, mortality, finitude, and the time, while being a devotee of the underground gods.

Heidegger's purpose in bringing Hölderlin's hymn "The Ister" and Sophocles' *Antigone* into a historical dialogue is that he sees a profound relationship between the ways in which both the river and Antigone move against, towards and within their destinies. The Ister runs its course moving away from the source and the homeland, and it looks to explore the possibility of becoming–at–home [*Heimischwerden*] by moving away

[123] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 93.

from the customary, daring to journey into the foreign. Yet, Antigone experiences the poetic essence of human finitude, and as such she grasps the limits of human dwelling, that is, being in the world as journeying towards death, by leaving behind the law of the city. If so, the key topological claim is the following one: the limit, as the between, "discloses" the possibility of the interplay between the bounding regions, which unfolds the finite nature of dwelling as existence in its entirety.

The river leaves behind its origins and springs into the unknown, by projecting itself into the future [*Zu-kunft*], that which is "to come", but also, that which has always "been coming"[124]. As I have explicated before, future, as that is yet to come and, at the same time, as that has always been coming, appears as the source of constant self-origination. This is precisely what the river accomplishes in flowing. At the same time, it appears as a limit through which one has to experience the "now" in its streaming from the past towards the future. Therefore, the flowing of the river must manifest the sense of immortality that is at stake for the poet, within the finite limits of the act of flowing. It flows within the boundaries of the riverbanks, the source and the sea. In that regard, Hölderlin associates the being of the flowing activity of river with the onto-ethical journeying of language. The hymn reads:

> Not in vain do Rivers run in the dry/ yet how? / Namely, they are to be to language. A sign is needed, nothing else, plain and simple[125]

This can be read in two ways: 1) Hölderlin says that there is a need of a sign that will capture the sense of the flowing activity of the river. This can mean that the poetic dwelling of the river must be poetically brought to word that will speak the dwelling of the

[124] The words and their meanings show a similar pattern of movement, springing from manifold sources, and historically moving beyond the presence by carrying along new significances through the contexts they traverse.
[125] (*The Ister,* 5)

river. In this way, the dwelling of the river will be intelligible for human beings, which remains forgotten. We are prone to conceive the river as a mere water source, or at best a natural entity. However, the river needs to be understood according to its own nature, therefore we need the poet to interpret and translate the activity of the river. 2) The river runs its course risking to dry up. Accordingly, the journeying of the river and the journeying of the language share the same fate. Hölderlin ends his hymn by saying:

> Yet, what that one does, that river/ No one knows" [Was aber jener thuet der Strom, Weis niemand]. [126]

According to Heidegger, it is only the poet that can actually know what the river does. It seems that Heidegger assumes that there is a certain mode of knowledge, which we can call poetic knowledge that only the poet possesses. When space and time are merely applied as frames to calculate and manipulate the unfolding of the nature, the limits of the dwelling of human beings, as well as the limits of nature itself disappear. This leads to the loss of the sense of the between that is the topological condition of poeticality. In the following passage, Heidegger highlights how our technological relation to the river covers over the non-utilitarian characteristics of the river:

> The hydroelectric plant is set into the current of the Rhine. It sets the Rhine to supplying its hydraulic pressure, which then sets the turbines turning. This turning sets those machines in motion whose thrust sets going the electric current for which the long-distance power station and its network of cables are set up to dispatch electricity. In the context of the interlocking processes pertaining to the orderly disposition of electrical energy, even the Rhine itself appears as something at our command. The hydroelectric plant is not built into the Rhine River as was the old wooden bridge that joined bank with bank for hundreds of years. Rather the river is dammed up into the power plant. What the river is now, namely, a water power supplier, derives from out of the essence of the power station.[127]

[126] (*The Ister*, 4)
[127] (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 16)

The example that Heidegger gives here is particularly important because it clarifies why we need a richer and more encompassing understanding of the streaming activity of the river. Indeed, this can be seen related to Heidegger's implicit criticism of sentiocentrism and biocentrism, and places Heidegger much closer to an "ecocentric" position. Even if the river is not a sentient being and has no phenomenal consciousness, it has its own *ethos*, namely, own way of dwelling and character. The true *ethos* of the river can make sense to us, if we poetically problematize its journeying.

According to Heidegger, we cannot grasp the being of the river in its entirety if we only conceive it as a mere resource or object: it rather must be understood in terms of what it "does" (according to the last line of Hölderlin's hymn, river "does" something that we do not know), and we must acknowledge the proper identity of the river as a river. Although the river does not have "actions" that can be located in a cause-effect scheme, it nevertheless fulfils its own being. Nevertheless, the fact that Heidegger's thinking can stimulate an ecological interpretation of our relation to nature does not mean that the core of his thinking can be captured by philosophy of ecology. First of all, the "*eco*" of "ecology" must be considered. In "eco-logy", what is at issue is first and foremost the "*logos*" of the "*oikos*", which can be understood as the knowledge and the saying of the "house" and dwelling that takes place in that "house". Second, it is not clear how an understanding of "ecology" can be developed without first thinking nature itself as the place of being and dwelling. This shows the adequacy of an onto-ethical and hermeneutic approach, because what is at issue here is not to consider nature as an entity or object of research that can be thought independently from human nature. What this means is that we need to look into the way in which nature as *physis* and *ethos* must be thought in relation, in terms of the question of dwelling. Therefore, even an ecologist reading of Heidegger's

thinking must first engage with the "onto-ethical" dimension of the question and consider the dwelling that unfolds in place.

In this context, it is interesting to briefly consider the consequences of the recent law that has passed in New Zealand, which has given the legal rights of "personhood" to the Wanganui River. Gerrard Albert, who is one of the negotiator of the local tribe, says: "[…] treating the river as a living entity is the correct way to approach it, as in indivisible whole, instead of the traditional model for the last 100 years of treating it from a perspective of ownership and management." [128] This recent juridical progress in New Zealand is a sign that it is possible to revise our ways of understanding of the place of non-human entities in the world. Furthermore, it is suggestive of the fact that a technological or economic understanding of the nature is not the only way, as a poetic interpretation of the "world" and the "nature" can bring about practical changes in politics. On the other hand, this case invites us to inquire, what does it mean to allocate "personhood" in order to protect its "rights"? What does this say about our conception of the river, which needs to be entitled with the rights of a "person" in order for us to not destroy or manipulate it? Furthermore, what does it say about our "*ethos*"? This is why it is useful to delve into the "onto-ethical" foundations of the being of rivers, and call into question our "relation" to them. This issue brings us back to the essence of poetry and poetic dwelling.

[128] Eleanore Ainge Roy, "New Zealand river granted same legal rights as human being", *The Guardian*, March 16, 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/16/new-zealand-river-granted-same-legal-rights-as-human-being

I. 6 Poesy, Poetry and Poetic Dwelling

Thus far I have examined the "onto-ethical" underpinnings of poetic dwelling in Heidegger's thought. I have shown that dwelling cannot be associated with mere staying in a fixed location. According to Heidegger, both the dwelling of Antigone and the river Ister indicate a poetic mode of journeying in the between as a mortal. The dynamic character of their dwelling means to stay with the whiling of the place. This makes it possible for one to belong to the interplay between the near and the distant, "here" and "beyond", mortals and immortals, the earth and the sky, which constitute the wholeness of the world within which one exists. It is this constant and dynamic mode of re-situating oneself in the world that appears as the topological characteristic of poetic dwelling. On the other hand, explaining that the place of poetic dwelling is the between does not necessarily answer why the between is poetic. One significant question that I seek to answer in this section is the following: what is the relation between poetry as a genre of literature and poetic dwelling as a way comporting oneself in existence?

In Heidegger scholarship, the difference between the poetic nature of dwelling and poetic works of literature is an issue that has not drawn significant attention. Explicating what "poetic dwelling" amounts to and how it differs from the mere writing of poetic works of literature is necessary, as this would illuminate what Heidegger means by "standing in a poetic relation to language", which is the core matter of his subsequent investigations on language. In that regard, I suggest that in Heidegger's thought, the poetic between should be understood as the source of creativity with respect to one's existence. In a nutshell, one's existence makes sense if it is examined, and the way to do so is to be poetic, which means to examine [*historein*] one's existence and situatedness in the world creatively and learn to become oneself. I claim that if we recognize the meaning of

poeticality as "creativity", only then we can fully recognize the significance of *poetic* dwelling for Heidegger's thought in the context of one's existence.

I find the traces of my interpretation in Heidegger's reading of ancient Greek philosophy. Although it is not explicated in the framework of the notion of "creativity", it is also clear that the meaning of the ancient Greek word *poiesis* is as an essential aspect of Heidegger's understanding of poeticality, and, indeed, of poetic dwelling. When we consider the etymology of *poiesis*, we see that the meaning of the word indicates a certain manner of "making"[129], a point that Heidegger himself mentions[130]. Explaining this point will also help us to see the relation between "building" and dwelling, a critical link in Heidegger's later thought in relation to the idea of poetry and poeticality.

Let me first make several conceptual distinctions. According to Heidegger, "poesy" [*Poesie*], as the poetic use of language, occurs from *poiesis*, yet, is not the same as poetry [*Dichtung*]. Although "poesy" is an outmoded word in English, it helps us identify the difference between "works of poetry" and a poetic mode of existence (poetic dwelling). For instance, one can write works of poetry, but that does not entail that she or he dwells poetically. On the other hand, someone who does not write works of poetry can still exist poetically. Heidegger clarifies what he does not mean by dwelling: accordingly, dwelling [*wohnen*] "does not describe today's dwelling conditions. Above all, it does not assert that to dwell means to occupy a house, a dwelling place. Nor does it say that the poetic exhausts itself in an unreal play of poetic imagination".[131] As such, it is not about "occupying a lodging". Likewise, when Hölderlin talks about dwelling, he means the existential situation of human beings in terms of how they poetically orient themselves in the world. It is not as if there were "dwelling" on the one hand, and the adjective

[129] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 572.
[130] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 212)
[131] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 212)

"poetical" on the other, attached to it as a positive attribute. Essentially, "poetical" makes the "dwelling". This is where the relation between building and dwelling comes to the fore *via* the essence of *poiesis* as making. Heidegger claims, "But through what do we attain to a dwelling place? Through building. Poetic creation, which lets us dwell, is a kind of building."[132] This is a making that is attained by language. On the other hand, this is not the mere mastery of language. It is first and foremost "measuring" against that which conditions the human being. This "measure" [*metron*] is the measuring of the dimension, the place, so that the humans can orient themselves in the world as the mortals, against the immortals, where the sky measures against the earth.[133] The "poetic", first and foremost, means making an issue of the "place" of human existence.

In light of these considerations, Heidegger's use of the adjective poetic/poetical [*dichterisch*] cannot refer to mere "poesy", as we have also seen with the dwelling of Antigone. She dwells poetically. The reason why the essence of poeticality matters so much is because it is closely related to humans' relation to language as the site within the boundaries of which things come to unfold. Heidegger claims that the specific kind of relation that one can hold to language, which "brings out" the essence of poetizing, is poetry [*Dichtung*], and to dwell poetically [*dichterisch wohnen*].[134] Yet, what is at issue in this act of "bringing out"? Furthermore, what is the trifold link between language, poetry and poetic dwelling? Answering these inquiries require a simultaneous reconsideration of the topological meaning of language and creativity, because the one significant element of "poetic dwelling" is poetic building, which is a form of "making". "Bringing out" as one of the characteristics of poeticality is closely tied to the "making" that is at issue, as by way of "making" something, we can "bring out" [*poiei*] that which is related to the

[132] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 213)
[133] (*Poetry, Language, Thought,* 219)
[134] In same train of thought, in 1946, Heidegger will write, "thinking is Ur-poetry which precedes poesy" (*Off the Beaten Track*, 247)

essence of the thing. That being said, "making" is not a synonym for "bringing out", but a more encompassing action that situates the act of "disclosure" and "unconcealment". In Heidegger's later writings in the early 1950s, the claim that dwelling is inherently related to building [*bauen*] is a key point. It is not a coincidence that one of Heidegger's most important essays on the question of dwelling is entitled *Building Dwelling Thinking* (1951), where Heidegger explicates the relation between building and dwelling:

> [*i*]*ch bin*, I am, *du bist*, you are, the imperative form *b*is, be. What then does *ich bin* mean? The old word *bauen*, to which the *bin* belongs, answers: *ich bin*, *du bist* mean: I dwell, you dwell. The way in which you are and I am, the manner in which we humans are on the earth, is *Buan*, dwelling. To be a human being means to be on the earth as a mortal. It means to dwell.[135]

Being, dwelling, and building are all closely related to one another. The act of building that is at issue here is not the mere erection of buildings. The key claim, which I will develop below, is that the essence of building cannot be found in the idea of production and fabrication, but in dwelling.[136]

We can see that building is related to a set of actions such as forming, creating, producing, and making. On the other hand, building, when thought in link with dwelling, is not only a certain "manner" or "art" of making, neither a mere act of form-giving, but making as the "measuring" of the place in the sense of "finding the limit and room", also related to Latin *meditari* in the sense of "think".[137] Finding the limit from which the boundary can commence its spacing is the ground of building, that is, *poiesis*, which itself derives from the Greek *poiein* (making). It is in this context that Heidegger's account of building and dwelling can be seen as topological, as Heidegger considers the essence of

---

[135] (*Poetry, Language, Thought,* 145)
[136] "We do not dwell because we have built, but we build and have built because we dwell, that is, because we are dwellers." (*Basic Writings*, 350)
[137] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 461.

dwelling to be "sparing" and "freeing" [*schonen* and *freien*]. Accordingly, he considers poetic dwelling as an action that provides space, and brings human beings and things into a free interrelation.[138] This is the sense in which we should comprehend Heidegger's interpretation of Hölderlin's understanding of *poiesis* as "measuring" that allows for "making". This means, the act of building that is at issue first needs to make space for something to grow and emerge in and from that place. Therefore, in order to better conceive how building and dwelling are related, we must first understand the relationship between space and place as well as "making" and "freeing".

The immediate etymological relationship between "freedom" [*Freiheit*] and "peace" [*Friede*] stimulates Heidegger's understanding of the bond between building and dwelling. According to Heidegger, building as dwelling fundamentally signifies to free and open up the space, which also means to bring peacefulness into space. Making-space within which things can emerge is one significant meaning of preserving the place. This is also the implication of dwelling [*wohnen*] as remaining in place [*sich aufenthalten*] by letting the place preserve a free and peaceful dimension from which new things can emerge and grow. In that context, the notion of creativity remains in a close relation to *physis* that indicates the unfolding of things in their abundant spontaneity from their hiddenness. The river Ister makes space by letting things around to emerge, grow and be built such as human dwellings. This means that first the nature must be saved poetically, if we expect a political tranquillity to flourish.

It is in this sense that building cannot be understood as mere production and the erection of buildings, but rather as creating a whole site of dwelling, making-way for a world of existence to emerge and grow in place. Furthermore, the existence that comes to occur in this site needs to bring tranquillity and ontological balance back to the place.

[138] (*Basic Writings*, 351)

Dwelling means to preserve the place that provides free space that within which things can freely and tranquilly emerge, grow, and remain and as such, *be*. As we can also observe from the etymology of the verb "to create", the more primordial meaning of Latin *crescere* is "to cause", or "to let grow", also interestingly related to the name of the Roman goddess Ceres, namely ancient Greek Demeter.[139] As such, the notion of creativity that is at issue is primarily related to letting something emerge and grow from place, principally from the earth. Making is not necessarily *pro-duction* in the sense of *leading-forth* and commanding, but rather creating in the sense of providing the space and preparing the conditions for growth. This is the sense in which Heidegger can say that the river dwells. The river makes and creates the space for building and dwelling. The poet does the same thing for human beings' existence.

It is in this framework that Heidegger's way of issuing the question of poetic dwelling invites us to reconsider the meaning of both poeticality as creativity in terms of one's existence and dwelling. Creativity can be thought in a rich hermeneutic-topological context, especially in terms of one's kinetic inter-action with one's existential "situation". This is because poetic creativity first and foremost means the disclosure of new "ways" of relating oneself to the world and things. It means the unfolding of new ways and possibilities of engaging with one's situation, creativity also indicates movement in the sense of "transgression", a going beyond the ordinary and envisioned limits, as was the case in Antigone's dwelling. Creativity does not indicate a mere *avant-garde*, or an ongoing experimentalism. The meaning of creativity should be rather sought in the correspondence between this motion that invokes transgression and regression, departure and arrival, which the flowing activity of the river Ister also brought forward. This is the sense in which creativity, as the nature of the *topos* of one's existential actions, does not

[139] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 175.

only “disclose”, but also makes way for the “gathering”. Accordingly, the “between” opens up the boundary and the dimension within which “building” as “making” becomes possible. The dweller of the between achieves creativity by standing in relation to the limit, thus confronting the beyond, and arriving at the possibility of bringing out something that has not been readily available and applicable in “presence”, which needs “disclosing” and “gathering”. This means that the between as that from which the possibility of poetic dwelling emerges creates the inhabitable space where creative building may take place. The poetic between is the “source” of creativity in providing the “measure” for the limit.

Władysław Tatarkiewicz’s historical and conceptual analysis of “creativity” also shows evidence that the essence of poetry indicates essential making and creating. His explorations into the issue can be considered in order to render Heidegger’s ideas more intelligible. According to Tatarkiewicz, for ancient Greeks, there was a decisive difference between poetry and art. While the former made use of and thrived on creativity, the latter was thought to be the imitation of the nature.[140] The artist was not expected to demonstrate an aesthetic sense of freedom, but, on the very contrary, his art was seen as an imitation and reproduction of the laws of nature. The poet, however, was the discloser and the creator of a new world of understanding within which things can come to unfold in an original way. Tatarkiewicz argues: “the poet is not bound by laws as artists are; he is free in what he does. There was no term corresponding to 'creativity' and 'creator', but in reality the poet was understood to be one who creates. And only he was so understood.”[141] In the Roman world, the Greek conception of creativity has evolved in a way that it was entitled

[140] Władysław Tatarkiewicz, *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics* (Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers, 1980), 245.
[141] Władysław Tatarkiewicz, *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*, 245.

to painters as well.[142] There were two words in use for "creating" in Latin, *facere* and *creare*, which both meant the ancient Greek *poiein*. However, in the Christian world, *creare* was associated with God's creation [*creation*] from nothing [*ex nihilo*], while *facere* indicated human beings' ordinary makings. As a result, even the poetry was thought to be subject to certain rules in the middle ages, as it was the case in the ancient Greek *techne*. As such, it was considered to be a matter of skilfulness, not necessarily creativity. In the wake of this separation, making (or doing) and creating indicated distinct modes of expression, the former referring to mere production or transformation of an object, while the latter meaning bringing out something from nothing.[143]

In his thinking of poetry and poetic dwelling, Heidegger extends the meaning of poetic creativity into one's existence and, thus, one's relation with being. This idea could make sense especially with regards to Antigone's dwelling. Antigone is neither a poet nor an artist, yet she dwells poetically. Nevertheless, for Heidegger she is the measure of poetic dwelling. What is also challenging to grasp is the poetic dwelling of the river Ister. Our first reaction might be that Heidegger's association of poetical dwelling with the river is intended only in a metaphorical way. Heidegger refutes a reading of the comparison between Antigone and the Ister,[144] which he takes to be an influence from Hegelian aesthetics that necessitates us to consider the river merely as a "symbolic image". Accordingly, we would not have to think the river itself in its streaming activity, but as a metaphor of some other entity. In this way, the river appears merely as an image [*Bild*] or a representation [*Vorstellung*] that distracts us thinking the flowing activity of the river itself. The issue is closely related to the essence of poesy and its difference from poetic dwelling, which needs to be clarified.

---

[142] Władysław Tatarkiewicz, *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*, 246.
[143] Władysław Tatarkiewicz, *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*, 248.
[144] (*The Ister*, 17-18)

In the 1930s, Heidegger initially juxtaposes poetic language with everyday language. According to Heidegger, the latter signifies the corrupted" form of language: "Poetic saying, however, falls into decline and becomes genuine, and then bad 'prose', which eventually becomes idle-talk".[145] Here Heidegger's critique of "everyday language" must be questioned. Separating poetic language from everyday language as such yields to a dualistic mode of thinking on the issue. However, the corruptness of everyday discourse that Heidegger mentions here is an outcome of our "relation" to language. In the 1934 lecture course *Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language*, Heidegger makes the following remark concerning the relationship between the poet and the works of poetry:

> However, the poet is not he who writes verses about the respective present. Poetry is no soothing for enthused little girls, no charm for the aesthetes, who believe that art is for savoring and licking. True poetry is the language of that being [*Sein*] that was forespoken to us a long time ago already and that we have never before caught up with. [146]

Heidegger's interpretation of poetry and art here alerts us to the fact that the matter at hand is not the mere production of poesy. Accordingly, Heidegger does not see poetry merely as an aesthetic and high use of language[147], but on the contrary, he sees poetic dwelling as the originary source of poesy. The significance of poetry does not lie in its literary value, but in the fact that it allows us to get near to the experience of dwelling in

---

[145] Martin Heidegger, *Hölderlin's Hymns Germania and Rhine*, trans. William McNeill and Julia Ireland (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 59.

[146] Martin Heidegger, *Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language*, trans. Wanda Torres Gregory and Yvonne Unna (Albany: SUNY Press, 2005), 141-142.

[147] That being said, it must be noted that in the 1930s and 1940s, Heidegger's ideas about the meaning of language are not well defined. We see Heidegger operating, at times, in the earlier register of the essence of language as discourse [*Rede*] as he designated in *Being and Time*. On the other hand, it is also clear from some of his rather fragmentary writings, such as the *Contributions to Philosophy* and *The Event*, that his thinking on the meaning of language already took course in a different direction compared to *Being and Time* period. This is the transition period in Heidegger's thought on language, and thus, his investigations on Hölderlin's poetry constitute the primary attempts to construct a more comprehensive view of language.

place.[148] Only if one can dwell poetically, then poesy can possess an authentically poetic element. This poetic element, as I have explicated, is creativity with regards to one's existence, which means one's capacity to "measure" the dimension within which one's existence takes place. This act of measuring is related to one's nearness to the limits of existence, which is demarcated by one's death. As such, the poetic "measure" of creativity is one's active participation of the happening (mutual conditioning) of the fourfold, where building as making and creating can occur. The river teaches human beings this creative "measure" of engaging with place and thus it cannot be a metaphorical "representation" or "image".

For Heidegger, the most essential poesy would be the one that shows the poetical essence of poetry, and this is precisely the reason why he engages with Sophocles' *Antigone* and Hölderlin's "The Ister" in the same context.[149] If poetry requires one to remain in a poetic relation to place, which is more fundamental than the act of producing poetic-literary works of art, then, poetic discourse means the kind of discourse that can show forth language in its unfolding as the "dwelling place" of human existence. In other words, with essential works of poetry, we can experience the poetic essence of language as the site (place) [*Ort*, *topos*] of poetical dwelling. This is why not all poetic discourse is essentially poetic, because not all works of poetry allow us to acknowledge the essence of poetical dwelling in its "taking place". The poetical and topological essence of language is that it provides the space in which one can build and dwell. For as the original meaning of the word *poiesis* indicates, "poetizing" essentially means "making", particularly making by "measuring". This means that if we miss the poetic understanding of language as the

[148] "This poietic force is to be thought idiomatically as Dichtung, which does not refer specifically to verse, poetry, or literature, but instead indicates the inventive momentum of artworks […] Dichtung refers to the poietic register of language, which comes to be disclosed in a special, transformed relation to language." Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 130.

[149] "Language is not poetry because it is the primal poesy; rather, poesy takes place in language because language preserves the original nature of poetry". (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 72)

dwelling place of human existence, we also risk missing the core of the issue of language and dwelling. In that regard, the adjective poetic [*dichterisch*] principally describes the "creative" way in which one relates oneself to language as the dwelling place where any building can come to occur.

I. 7 From The Fourfold to Place and Language

Thus far I have shown the way in which "the between" appears as the site of poetic dwelling and how to link poetry with the idea of poetic dwelling in Heidegger's thought, mainly departing from a topological examination of Antigone and the Ister, focusing on the meaning of "creativity" with regards to the essence of poetic making and existence. The poet, as the dweller of "the between" shows forth the meaning of language as the onto-ethical dwelling place of human existence. In that vein of thinking, the central arguments of the section are as follows: 1) Heidegger's mature account of the fourfold in the late-1940s develops on the basis of his earlier lecture courses on Hölderlin. 2) Heidegger arrives at the notion of the fourfold by engaging with the idea of mortality in a topological manner, mainly bringing up the question of the dimensions and regions of dwelling. 3) Heidegger lays the foundations of his mature account of language from the 1940s and 1950s on the basis of the notion of the fourfold as the taking place of dwelling. Therefore, this section will be about how showing the basis of the fourfold allows us to understand Heidegger's later account of language.

We find the final version of Heidegger's fourfold in *The Thing* essay, which is originally a lecture course from 1949-50 given in Bremen. As I have shown, Heidegger commenced to develop the notion in the 1930s, by focusing on the relation between the mortals and immortals, and by issuing human beings' dwelling place in the world. In the

Origin of the Work of Art essay, the strife between the earth [*Erde*] and the world [*Welt*] was a significant element of the mutual conditioning that takes place between the constituents of the fourfold.[150] The difference between these two notions comes to the fore in Heidegger's discussion of Van Gogh's 1885 painting "A pair of Shoes".[151] As ordinary "things", the pair of shoes belongs to the world of the peasant. The world of the peasant means the web of significances that determine and shape the context of her life. The pair of shoes that are used in the field shows forth the world of the peasant, and in doing so; it immediately summons us to understanding the peasant's relation to the earth, because the peasant earns his life from the earth. As a "thing", the pair of shoes appears as "the between" (that which discloses and gathers) of our understanding of them and their material presence. The realm of significance within which peasant's life makes sense is distinct from the earth, where the peasant's material life continues. The earth gives concrete space for the world of the peasant, while the world of the peasant allows the earth to have a meaning and appear as the earth to our understanding. The strife between the two is a back and forth movement. Without the earth, the world does not exist; yet without the world, the earth does not appear as the earth, and remains as an unintelligible physical matter out there.

In his later work, Heidegger replaced the notion of the "world" with the "sky". As such, the earth and the sky constituted the two ends of the axis of "spatiality". The main reason for this should be that Heidegger aimed to avoid presenting the two-way interplay between the earth and the world as a dualism that is suggestive of the philosophical dispute between "idealism" (the world) and "realism" (the earth). It is possible to interpret the case as follows: Later Heidegger acknowledged that earth appears as the earth insofar as human beings have a world, just as much any world can exist if and only if there is the

[150] (*Poetry, Language, Thought,* 61)
[151] (*Basic Writings*, 159)

earth. This has two significances: 1) the earth does not stand in a mere opposition to the world, just as the earth cannot even make sense beyond the hermeneutic capacities of human beings as mortals. Only insofar as there is a human world, there is the earth available to the intelligence of human existence. 2) The earth appears as the earth only for the mortals. It never signifies mere soil or ground. In order to recognize the earth as the earth, human beings need to have a direct relation to the changing of the seasons, the growth of plants, the lives of the animals. They must work with and on the earth in order to understand it. Only insofar as the earth appears as that which conditions their existence, the earth appears as the ground of their journeying from birth to death. In that sense, the earth can appear as the place of "the between" for the mortals.

Replacing the world with the sky (and/or heaven) and placing the immortals as those who can condition the existence of human beings, Heidegger designates two sites of dwelling that represent two modes of being. The four components of the fourfold, sky, earth, immortals and mortals, constitute the "world" as the place of the thing. The thing is that by which the unity of the four takes place. In other words, the thing, such as the jug[152], is the medium by which the mortals find their orientation on the earth, in remaining open to the appearance of a sense of holiness. Insofar as it is the thing that gathers the four, the thing appears as the place of the happening of the fourfold.[153] The two dimensions of dwelling are mortality and immortality, which establish the "temporal"[154]

[152] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 171)
[153] Yet, the "thing" appears *as* the "thing" insofar as there is language.
[154] When the "spatial" is placed against "temporal" as such, we must be careful to distinguish the topological unity that is at issue, so that "time" and "space" are not to be merely conceived as binary notions. *Time and space* co-emerge from the *topos* of dwelling. As such, it is important to note that regarding the issue of temporality, Sheehan acknowledges Heidegger's topological understanding of the notion: "In 1969 he [Heidegger] redefined "temporality" (*Zeitlichkeit*) as man's original dis-closedness or openedness, ἀλήθεια-1. We would do well, therefore, to retire the word "temporality" from Heidegger scholarship, or at least to put it under heavy erasure, when speaking of the thrown-open ("ex-static") dis-closedness of ex-sistence." Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 168-169.

axis of the fourfold, while the "spatial" axis consists of the sky and the earth. Heidegger writes at the beginning of *The Thing* essay: "All distances in time and space are shrinking."[155] This is the same idea that appeared in *The Ister* lectures that led Heidegger to modify the concept of temporality with "journeying" [*Wanderschaft*] and spatiality with "site" [*Ortschaft*] in order to draw attention to the significance of rethinking our relation to time and space. This is the way in which Heidegger ventures to examine the possibility of undergoing a new experience with the place of dwelling, which is also the commencement of his thinking on the possibility of undergoing a new experience with language as the event, that is, two-fold unfolding of *topos*.

The fourfold is the most crucial concept in Heidegger's late account of dwelling. With that concept Heidegger aims to develop his implicit understanding of place as the open bounded. In that sense, the fourfold appears as an advanced formulation of the early "being-in-the-world" [*In-der-Welt-sein*] from *Being and Time*[156]. Now, the meaning of dwelling exceeds the limits of human world.[157] That being said, the fourfold cannot be made sense of as an immediately present state of correlations that can be readily found in the nature as such. In that sense, my approach concerning the fourfold is similar to Mitchell's reading. Mitchell attempts to "take Heidegger at his word" in explaining the notion of the fourfold in relation to the idea of the thing [*Ding*][158], which I interpret in relation to the topological grounds upon which the conception of the fourfold is constructed. As Mitchell suggests, "Once again, if we think we have got hold of the between by finding it between two presences, we have lost it […] the between is thus the

[155] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 163)
[156] This is an important issue that I also discuss in the last chapter, in comparing the "fourfold" and "being-in-the-world".
[157] (*On The Way to Language*, 106)
[158] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 4.

site of relations, not of presences"[159]. In discussing the "medium" and the "relation", Mitchell argues:

> The medium is not simply "between" the things, rather, in some abstract geometrical sense, it surrounds them. The things are immersed in it. It is the field of their interaction, that through which streams the relations that they maintain.[160]

What Mitchell here peculiarly calls "some abstract geometrical sense", is precisely the topological element that I have been discussing. The following passage from Malpas explains further the necessity of a topological engagement, especially with regards to the relation between the place of human being in the world, and how the fourfold draws attention to the question of place: "What threatens dwelling is, indeed, the loss of such questionability, the loss of concealment, the loss of finitude and boundedness—the loss, one might say, of the nearness to the holy, of a proper "*ethos*," of a proper place.[161] Mitchell argues that, in Heidegger scholarship the fourfold is taken out of the Heideggerian context that to which it needs to be brought back.[162] The main issue regarding the fourfold is to explain what "relationality" is about. A mere description and elaboration of the constituents of the fourfold, mortals, immortals, sky and earth, does not suffice in terms of explaining why and how they are related to one another. Furthermore, saying that things are all the way down relational does not add much of new information. What we need to learn is the essence of the dynamic movement, the nature of the "event" itself that gathers the four constituents that condition one another.

Heidegger's notion of the fourfold is an attempt to explicate human beings' "onto-ethical" situation with regards to the reciprocal movement as journeying between the near

[159] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 121.
[160] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*, 5.
[161] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 277.
[162] Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*, 4.

and the distant. This is why he claims that the question of nearness and distance cannot be asked *via* the notions of calculable time and space, just as the question of dwelling needs to be primarily posed onto-ethically (topologically) and not spatially, geographically, historically, politically, sociologically and such. The fact that I can take the next plane to fly wherever I wish to go does bring no nearness or connectedness, but on the contrary, by concealing the time and place in-between, it destroys the possibility of nearness. Malpas suggests how the thing and place should be considered in connection, especially with regards to the issue that Heidegger's fourfold brings out:

> The way in which the question of nearness, and of the thing, are here tied together is indicative of the way in which what is at issue in both the question of nearness and the question of the thing is the question of the "there/here," of "place," for it is only in relation to "there/here," only in relation to place, that anything can be near or far.[163]

As Heidegger writes, "the persisting nature of nearness is not the interstice, but the movement paving the way for the face-to-face of the regions of the world's fourfold. This movement is nearness in the nature of nighness."[164] Although the fourness of the fourfold may give rise to the impression that it is a square-like structure that consists of four fixed points, the very movement that connects the four components must be a circular one:

> The fouring, the unity of the four, presences as the appropriating mirror-play of the betrothed, each to the other in simple oneness. The fouring presences as the worlding of world. The mirror-play of world is the round dance of appropriating. Therefore, the round dance does not encompass the four like a hoop. The round dance is the ring that joins while it plays as mirroring. Appropriating, it lightens the four into the radiance of their simple oneness.[165]

---

[163] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 227.
[164] (*On the Way to Language*, 104)
[165] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 178)

The circular round–dance [*Gering*] points out the fact that dwelling does not get initiated by any of the regions, but all components of the fourfold simultaneously partake in the happening of this constant and circular movement.[166] If the "fouring" movement of the fourfold is activated by the event [*Ereignis*], which also means the mutual "appropriation" of the dimensions of the fourfold, and if this is meant to represent the very emergence of the "there" [*Da*] as the world of human existence, then, this implies that this very movement shows the very interaction between the human beings and the unfolding of being that occurs as an inter-play. It is their gathered disclosure in place that situates them in the same interaction and interplay. Fourfold is precisely this "play-field" [*Spielraum*], the mirroring mutual conditioning.

I. 8 The Fourfold: Capobianco, Sheehan, Malpas on Truth, Meaning and Place

In terms of the question of the fourfold and dwelling, Heidegger's is mainly concerned with the possibility of providing a poetic paradigm within which humans can come to reconsider their relation to the world. Only after refining the way in which they comport themselves to things, human beings can pose the question of being under a new light, which would allow for a new interpretation of the meaning of being to emerge. In recent Heidegger scholarship, human beings' relation to being, as well as the question as to the meaning and truth of being, has become a point of focus. Two central Heidegger scholars, namely Sheehan and Capobianco, disagree as to whether it is self manifestation of "being itself" that renders human beings as the kind of beings that they "are", or instead, whether

[166] Starting from the 1950s, Heidegger defines the nature of letting-dwell "regioning" [*Gegnen*], which derives from the German word "*gegen*" that means "against", but also "toward". So the notion has both the "nearing" and "distancing" associations, signalling a two-way motion.

it is the hermeneutic structure of human existence that projects and makes sense of being. Discussing these two conflicting standpoints will help me to emphasize the necessity of looking into the issue from a topological perspective by engaging with the question of language and dwelling.

According to Capobianco, being [*Sein*] remains the single issue for Heidegger's thinking, and being amounts to the truth [*aletheia*] of being, or as later Heidegger called it, the "appropriation", or "event". [*Ereignis*]. Capobianco contends the idea that it is human *logos,* which he considers our self-conscious intelligence that permits us to comprehend being as such. The idea is that the manifestation of being itself overflows our transcendental sense-making capacities. It is rather that we understand ourselves as human beings thanks to the emergence of being itself. For Capobianco, later Heidegger consistently tried to set himself free from the transcendental-phenomenological philosophy of consciousness that interprets being as that which exists in the human consciousness. He associates this line of thinking with Sheehan's recent reading of Heidegger. In Capobianco's interpretation, it is being as *aletheia* and *physis* that determines human beings' way of being. In short, if there is no manifestation of being, then, there is no understanding–meaning of being either. Capobianco claims:

> [I]nsofar as there is manifestation, emergence, is there meaning at all. Thus, Being *qua* manifestation is structurally prior to, and the ontological condition of, meaning. Being structurally precedes and exceeds meaning. Being is irreducible to meaning.[167]

In other words, for us to be able to make sense of anything, being itself must become manifest. The fact that we are, ontologically precedes the fact that we are the kind of species that comport themselves to understand the meaning of being. Human beings are

[167] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 4.

the "there" [*Da*] (to-which) of the manifestation of being. In that, they are simply receptive. If human beings can respond to the manifestation of being as the "there", it is so by virtue of the fact that they remain secondary and passive in this occurrence of the act of self-manifesting. As Capobianco argues, "Yet die Sache: not principally Dasein, but Sein qua manifestation – what Heidegger came to call "the truth of Being" – in relation to Dasein."[168] If there is no "being", then there can be no "there" and "being-there" [*Dasein*] either. The "there" that refers Dasein's worldliness is primarily opened up by the self-manifestation of being. Human beings are mere passive receivers of the ways in which *physis* spatiotemporally springs out.

Sheehan argues for the opposite position. He states that being [*Sein*] has never been the actual matter of Heidegger's inquiries.[169] If this were the case, he claims, Heidegger would not have been any different from other philosophers in the history of philosophy. It is characteristic of a metaphysical approach, delineating the substance of being with countless different conceptualizations, such as *idea*, *ousia*, God, absolute mind, will, will to power, etc., which Heidegger seeks to eliminate. The very core of Heidegger's thought is that he tried to understand the fundamental existential structure that gives rise to an "understanding" of being[170], namely, whatever it is that allows us to issue the meaning of being in the first place. In other words, it is about the source that allows us to consider things *as* things. Sheehan asserts that it would be impossible to imagine something like being, let alone grasp or be open to the manifestation of being, if first and foremost we do not possess the hermeneutic sense-making capacities that we possess. In order to be able

[168] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 4.
[169] "I try to make sense of Heidegger by showing that his work, both early and late, was not about "being" as Western philosophy has understood that term for over twenty-five hundred years, but rather about sense itself: meaningfulness and its source" *in* Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), xi.
[170] One thing that I should mention here is, as a matter of fact, Capobianco is not interested in the "conception" of being, but rather, he concerns himself with "experiencing" the happening of being, which is a point that Sheehan might be missing.

to perceive and cognize phenomenal objects, I need to have eyes and a nervous system that transmits signals to the brain. This does not mean that things out there do not exist if I am blind, just as it does not mean that it is my "seeing" that makes things to exist in the external world. But insofar as the act of "seeing" is what is at stake, I would not be able to see things *as* things without my eyes. Likewise, if I do not have the hermeneutic structure that constitutes my existence as the openness of being, I cannot be able to make sense of things in terms of their being. We are all essentially hermeneutic and thrown into the world as understanding beings.[171] Things are not mere stuff for us, but they make sense to us as things with meaning. The core of Sheehan's account is that we always find ourselves already attuned to the world, making sense of thing. Even someone who claims that phenomena in the world do not make any sense, her/his criterion for making this judgment would be measured against our capacity of understanding. According to Sheehan:

> We are a hermeneutical field of force, like a magnet that draws things together into unities of sense insofar as these things are connected with a possibility of ourselves as the final point of reference. Anything outside the scope of our embodied hermeneutical ken does not make sense.[172]

Said differently, we could physically exist just like other material entities, but this would not even become an issue for us. Otherwise, like some animals who have no visual capacities to see certain colours, we would be being-blind, if we did not wear these hermeneutical lenses.

One of the reasons why Sheehan and Capobianco disagree is because they do not focus on the situated character of the interaction between being and human beings. On the one hand, there is some sort of physical existence out there, and certainly it is possible to assume that the presence of the *cosmos* is independent from our conscious making sense

[171] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 104.
[172] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 104.

of it. Yet, being needs the presence of some kind of entity that comports itself to the meaningful appearance of things and makes sense of them *as* things. It is in this way being can be understood as meaningfully recognizable reality. However, it is also possible to look to the issue from a topological perspective: being and human beings need to be gathered in the same event that puts them in contact, a site in which being can appear to human being, as well as human being can remain receptive and approach to the self-manifesting of being. The very act of remaining in this neighbourhood is the primary meaning of dwelling. This is the site of the event, as the dwelling place of human existence, which "situates" both an understanding and experience of being and the self-manifestation of being, in the same interplay. In other words, the event situates both being and human being in the same site of dwelling and correspondence, which is "the between".

In Heidegger scholarship, Malpas advocates the view that "to be" means "to be situated" in place. Following Heidegger, Malpas refutes the view that the situated nature of our being in place is meant in a metaphorical way. We stand in a relation to the world insofar as we perceive the situated nature of the thing. The thing opens up itself to the world, which is a dimension within which the interaction and relationality of things takes place in the mode of a correspondence.[173] It is in this "open-boundedness" that I can approach and perceive the thing in its being, and in this way the thing can appear in my field of understanding as a thing to be meaningfully understood. The essence of that relation is two-fold, as both my understanding of the thing and the thing's self-disclosure towards me is a reciprocal event. This is the opening up of the world *via* the thing. The happening of the place is this middle region as a between, the medium that gathers my being and the being of things in the same open-boundedness.

[173] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 248.

Malpas' account of place has Aristotelian and Heideggerian sources: 1) the liminal understanding of place as *topos* as the bounding vessel, and 2) the understanding of place as *Ort* and *Ortschaft* as the happening of meaningful presencing from the "there" [*Da*], which is the event [*Ereignis*]. With Malpas' spatial and topological investigations of the notion of the fourfold, the understanding of place as open bounded comes to the fore: place is that which delimits the opening up of space, as well as the opening that discloses the boundaries of the space.[174] Place is neither an enclosed container nor mere infinite openness, but on the contrary, it is that which both provides the journeying while demarcating the limits of its boundary.

Malpas elaborates the spatial characteristics of place by thinking in terms of Aristotle's notion of *topos* from his *Physics*. In the history of philosophy, Aristotle's account of place is one of the first explicit discussions of place *qua* place.[175] His explications with regards to the notion of movement[176] and corporeality of being are also essential for better understanding Heidegger's discussion of place and boundary. The first premise that Aristotle considers is the view that "whatever exists exists somewhere"[177]. This holds true for all phenomena except for the "unmoveable mover", which is located outside of "place". If everything must be somewhere, then, that which is encompassed and contained in that "space" also must be somewhere; however, this process of containment cannot go on *ad infinitum*. This is where we observe the immediate relationship between "body" and "place", a connection that is fundamental for Aristotle's account.

---

[174] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, 221.
[175] What Malpas is hesitant in explaining in detail, but what I find crucial is that in Aristotle's examination of the concept of place as *topos* appears as the precondition of movement [*kinesis*] in *Physics.* Aristotle, *Physics*, I-IV, vol. 1-2, trans. Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 277–327.
[176] The translator of *Physics* warns us that the notion of movement [*kinesi*s] has many different meanings, such as the transition between places, passaging, as well as growth from a sapling into a tree. Aristotle, *Physics*, I-IV, vol. 1-2, trans. Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford, 274.
[177] Aristotle, *Physics*, IV, 1, 208 a 80–81.

In his discussion of *topos*, Aristotle examines the links between space, spatiality and the location of beings.[178] We must note that, in *Physics* Aristotle is not interested in a hermeneutical discussion of place with regards to the issue of human dwelling. These are issues that belong to the domain "ethics", where *ethos* is thematized in terms of the habits (custom) of human character. In *Physics*, he concerns himself with the location of beings, thus he addresses place as that which holds the phenomenon in a specific location. Accordingly, place itself is not a body in which beings are located. Namely, if place were to be a body, then the body that it contains would have no place in which it could exist. In this way, two bodies would collapse into one another, which is not possible.[179]

Aristotle denies the view that place can be conceived of as a content (*hyle*) or a form (*eidos*), which is a direct criticism of Plato's notion of place as "*chora*" that he developed in *Timaeus* as the infinite womb, or spectacle that which includes everything in the universe.[180] In that regard, Aristotle also refutes that an object cannot be encompassed in itself, again, in light of the idea that an object's place must be something other than the object itself, because both matter and form are already contained in the nature of the object.

Aristotle's own account of place comes in the chapter IV of the *Physics*. For Aristotle, the place of a thing is the inner surface of the envelope in which it is encompassed. That which embraces the phenomenon in its entirety, yet at the same time, that through which the phenomenon is wholly distinguished from its spatial location, is the proper place of that entity. In other words, that which embodies the object also constitutes its place. The place of the object remains attached to the surface of it. The object's proper

[178] Malpas argues that Heidegger's early discussion of "insideness" [*Inwendigkeit*] is where we see an Aristotelian notion of spatial containment. See: Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 69-70.
[179] Aristotle, *Physics*, IV, 1, 209 a 5–8.
[180] Sallis discusses Plato's "*chora*" in his significant study on the topic. See: John Sallis, *Chorology: On Beginning in Plato's Timaeus*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

place touches the outside surface of itself. As such, the place of the object completely envelops the body of the object. Therefore, place is not the dimensional extension that stretches between the object and that in which it is contained, but place is that which embodies the body of the object by corporeally surrounding it. If this is so, then, wherever I move, I am already embodied in my own place that contains me and distinguishes me from my outside as my boundary [*peras*]. My extension in space can only begin to the extent that my body is bounded in place. Place is inseparably enclosed to the body that it encompasses, and therefore place is intrinsically related to the particular object that it embodies. Otherwise the thing would be incorporeal, that is, it would be placeless. Although Aristotle's discussion of place is in spatial terms, it does not consider place as a mere mathematical-geometrical space, but rather as a vessel that embodies the phenomenon in a particular way.

It is significant to note in that context that Aristotle also makes explicit the relationship between movement and place. Aristotle argues: "We must recognize that no speculations as to place would ever have arisen had there been no such thing as movement, or change of place."[181] As Brogan points out:

> A natural being for Aristotle is never reducible to its material extension. It is always a concrete being, a *tode ti*, a "this". Only that which is a being can take its place and leave it. Place is not an indifferent container that defines the being. Rather, the being arrives in its place and thereby its place first comes to be.[182]

Aristotle explains this relationship between place and movement with the example of the location of a boat floating on the river. When the boat changes its location, if the place of the body is also in motion, this means that the boat nevertheless remains embodied and

[181] Aristotle, *Physics*, IV, 1, 211 a 15–18.
[182] Walter A. Brogan, *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2005), 36.

situated. Although the physical location of the boat may change from one location to another, the boat, in each and every case, has its own embodied space. Aristotle explains this by stating that "place [is] an 'immovable vessel', and vessel [is] a 'moveable place'"[183] The proper place of the boat is not the flowing water, the river bed, the banks of the river, or the empty space which is filled with the extension of the river. The place of the boat is the unity of that which environs and embodies river, and as such, river constantly appears as the site of the boat.[184] In its flowing movement, although the location of the boat on the river changes, its place remains the same because the boat has its proper place that can move with itself independent of where it moves in space.

Aristotle issues the link between *kinesis* and *topos* in terms of physical space and containment. In that context, I also consider the necessity of the relationship between movement and place in "onto-ethical" and hermeneutic terms. Although Aristotle's account of place as *topos* does not tell us what a dwelling place is, nevertheless, a significant aspect of *topos* becomes explicit on the basis of an understanding of the movement of things. In that sense, dwelling in place does not indicate a mere remaining in a particular location, but rather it indicates the interaction and interplay between place and movement. In light of this idea, we can see the reason why Heidegger calls the later phase of his thought "topology of being" and not "chorology of being". The notion of "*chora*" constitutes the basis of Plato's account of place. Plato prioritizes the spatial locatedness of all phenomena in space. As such, *chora* emerges as the womb of things, whereas Aristotelian *topos* indicates the bodily interface between beings: being means being-in-

[183] Aristotle, *Physics*, IV, 1, 212 a 15–16.
[184] Aristotle, *Physics*, IV, 1, 212 a 20

movement.[185] The place of a thing does not only signify the "where", that is, but rather it also indicates the movement and interface between *whence* and *whither*.

These clarifications of Aristotle's account of place brings us back to the question of the event [*Ereignis*] and the fourfold, and its relation to the two characteristics of place, boundedness and openness. In *The Thing* essay, the simple diagram that Heidegger illustrated shows a capital E signifying the "event" [*Ereignis*] with a note next to it that reads "there" [*Da*]. This could be interpreted as meaning the taking place of the event is also the taking place of the "there" [*Da*].[186] What does that mean? 1) In an ontological register, the event denotes the spatiotemporal emergence of all entities in nature, becoming what they are as entities. 2) In an "onto-ethical" register, the event is the gathering of being and human beings in the same site of being, where the meaning of things could be understood and experienced by human beings *via* dwelling in place. The event is not a particular political or historical event, but rather it is the primary happening that makes things to appear and make sense as the kind of beings that they are.

It must be noted that in Heidegger's diagram, the event as the cleared-open region appears at the very centre of the fourfold. "There" [*Da*] that is at issue is the "t/here" of the being-there [*Da-sein*] as the essence of the existence of human beings, where the unconcealment of being occurs. As such, the place is the "t/here" in the sense that it is both the openness of being and the centre of gravity of the fourfold. By issuing the there [*Da*], event [*Ereignis*] and the fourfold [*Geviert*] in the same context, Heidegger wishes to develop the meaning of the *Da* as the site of nearness within the boundaries of which the

[185] As Brogan suggests: "It is this way of being that directs and makes possible the kinds of motion that beings undergo. This way of being is *physis*. *Physis* is the *arche* of beings that move according to their nature. *Physis* is not motion but the *arche* of the motion in beings such that it lets them be the beings they are." Walter A. Brogan, *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2005), 79.

[186] In their respective readings, Malpas and Mitchell agree on this point that the capital E refers the *Ereignis*. Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 226; Andrew Mitchell, *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015), 118.

self-opening, manifestation of being as the event, takes place.[187] This means the open-bounded allows for the near and the distant to come into an interplay.

Now, in addition to Malpas' account of place as the "open bounded", according to Heidegger this "middle" ground, the open bounded and the place of nearness where human beings find the possibility of dwelling, is the topological meaning of "language" as place. Language, as "the between", as Heidegger calls is, the "relation of all relations"[188]. The relationality that takes place with and within the fourfold is not some arbitrary, neutral correlativity. It does not signify a mere context of neutral connections. It is the emergence of the possibility of any interrelation to appear in the same context. It follows that one of the definitions of language for Heidegger is as follows: language is the most basic contextual ground that in, through and by which things are gathered and disclosed to one another as relevant and meaningful structures and entities. In other words, before language comes to signify "discourse", it refers to the place of the meaningful emergence of the world that hosts the meaningful co-responsiveness of things.

With Heidegger's explorations into the nature of event and fourfold, we discover an implicit sense of language as the between of being and human being, as the central movement and kinetic space. As such, I claim that Heidegger understands language not simply as discourse, but as that larger context of correspondence of being and human being *via* the event, which makes space for any intelligibility, discourse and communication. Language can never come to mean mere communication at first, but initially it appears as the ground upon which any communication as interaction can take place. We can ask why do we have to call such a phenomenon language? We could not we call this topological register of language "intelligibility" or "understanding" because language does not only signify the mere understanding or processing a set of facts, but

[187] (*Poetry, Language, Thought,* 60)
[188] (*On the Way to Language*, 107)

also the act of making space for responding to what we perceive. The happening of language has a place-character because of the reciprocal interplay in which it places human beings *vis-à-vis* being.

Let me remind us how we arrived at this topological significance of language. At the commencement of this chapter I delved into the debate between Capobianco and Sheehan in attempting to resolve the disagreement concerning the place and role of human being in terms of its relation to being. I proposed a topological way of seeing the issue by focusing on the "place" of being, where the "truth" of the "meaning" of being can come to unfold. After having clarified Aristotle's account of place and the relation between *topos* and *kinesis*, I have mentioned Malpas' thought of place, which emphasizes the situated nature of human existence in place. According to Malpas' understanding of place as the open bounded, human existence is bounded by its finitude, yet always facing the openness of the self-manifestation of being in making sense of things in the world. Here I have two arguments: 1) If human existence is situated in place, and if the place of poetic dwelling is "the between", I interpret this onto-ethical "between" and "medium" to be language which both encompasses human being, while both placing human being in the openness of an understanding of being 2) If the fourfold is Heidegger's later designation of the meaning of dwelling in the world, and if Heidegger considers the event as the happening of the "there" [*Da*], then, the happening of "place" also indicates the happening of "language" as the medium, which situates immortals, mortals, sky and earth in the same "circular" movement in the neighbourhood of one another. In other words, language can be understood as a site of correspondence, as well as the happening of the "medium". Dwelling in language as the site of the event, human existence is both active and passive, both venturing towards the meaning of being, as well as receiving the manifestation of being.

In light of these views, it appears that the topological dimension within which poetic dwelling takes place constitutes the basis of the broader sense of language that Heidegger aimed to bring to the fore in his subsequent thought. Therefore we should not look for a simplistic concept of language in Heidegger's thought as a means of communication, but we should look for a richer understanding of language by considering the "interaction" and "relation" between human beings and being, as well as by looking into the nature of being situated in place. In this chapter I have shown that what Heidegger comes to mean by "language" can only be discovered after having examined what "poetic dwelling" means. In the next chapter, I will investigate Heidegger's statement that "language is the house of being" in a similar way.

In this chapter, I have argued that in order to have a better comprehension of Heidegger's later idea of language, we need to understand what it means to have a poetic relation to language. Without maintaining this poetic relation to language, its essence does not become apparent in its entirety. This required me to examine the place-character of dwelling in Heidegger's thought in the 1930s and 1940s as "the between", which brought us to the meaning of poetic dwelling. Looking to the place-character of our relation to language demanded an "onto-ethical" investigation, which I considered to be the main feature of hermeneutic topology. With hermeneutic topology, we can have an account of the situated essence of human existence as the openness (clearing, or the there [*Da*]) of being in language. In this way, we can develop the argument that Heidegger understands dwelling as an action (indeed, an action that does not cause an immediate effect or change, but an active way of orienting oneself upon which any *praxis* is built). This requires us to ask the place of the question of "ethics" in his thinking.

II. The Topological Turn: The "Letter on Humanism"

The main text that I will discuss in this chapter is Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism" (1947). In the letter, Heidegger advances a strong "onto-ethical" position in looking into the essence of language and its significance for human existence by stating that language is the "house of being". Heidegger discusses language as the *ethos* of human essence, as the site of being in which human being first emerges as human being, and dwells. In that regard, I will show that Heidegger's interpretation of *ethos* determines his understands of "ethics" of dwelling in language. As such, Heidegger considers "ethics" and "action" beyond the limits of human subjectivity and inter-subjectivity. In that way, the link between being, human being, place, and language itself comes to the fore via an interpretation of "ethics" linked to the question of dwelling.

My line of thinking in this chapter will be as follows: 1) I provide an exposition of the "Letter on Humanism" in order to show what is at stake with Heidegger's slogan "language is the house of being". I argue that the slogan needs to be topologically by underscoring the "onto-ethical" essence of the relation between human beings and language. 2) I show why and how Heidegger problematizes the place of ethics via the question of language and dwelling, instead of giving an ethical theory of action, which distinguishes his line of thinking from other thinkers. In that regard, I take issue with Johanna Hodge's analysis of Heidegger's "ethics". 3) After explaining why Heidegger's "ethics of language" should be read as his "topology of language", I discuss the connection between being, place, and language. I develop the topological argument concerning the relationship between *Da*, as the open and relational site of being, and language. In doing so, I return to the Sheehan and Capobianco debate on the issue, in order to clarify the meaning of *aletheia* and its link to place and language. 4) After

discussing the meaning of human "existence", I bring into view Joseph Fell's comparison of Sartre and Heidegger on the question of existence, subjectivity, and humanism, showing why Heidegger's understanding of existence cannot be treated only within the boundaries of subjectivity, and that it must be thought in relation to the happening of the site of being itself. 5) I conclude the chapter with a detailed discussion on Heidegger's critique of philosophy as metaphysics. I suggest that Heidegger's topology of language constitutes the basis of his post-metaphysical thinking moving to his mature thought on language in *On the Way to Language*.

II. 1 Language, Being, Human Being

At the very outset of the "Letter on Humanism", Heidegger responds to the following question raised by his colleague and friend Jean Beaufret: "How can we restore the meaning of humanism in the 20th century?" [189] This question allows Heidegger to open up a discussion concerning the relation between being and human being. Initially, I would like to emphasize the point that for Heidegger, human being means the kind of being that has an explicit relation to its own "being" [*Sein*] "there" [*Da*] in the world. The "onto-ethical" essence of human existence comes before its biological, psychological, anthropological characteristics. The entire letter is a reconsideration of that specific relation (being–human being), by looking at how language determines the place of existence.

With the question concerning the meaning of humanism, the essence of human existence becomes the central issue in the letter. Heidegger mentions Christianity, the Renaissance, and Marxism as three distinct examples of "humanism" in the history of the

[189] Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism", in *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 239-277. (From here on: "Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*)

Occident, which he considers inadequate in thinking the "essence" of the human.[190] All three movements think of the essence of human being with regard to something other than its existence. Even Sartre's "existentialism", whose subject matter is to re-think the meaning of human existence, is an arbitrary one, insofar as he treats "existence" in a metaphysical way by putting in a dualistic relation with "essence" (*essentia*)[191]. In effect, for Heidegger, existence is the way of being of human beings, and in that sense, it is also both the essence and existence. Yet, what does the essence of human existence precisely amount to? Keeping this question in view, we can read Heidegger's critique of humanism, re-examining the conception of "human" in "humanisms" in Occidental thought. With this in view, the focus of the inquiry turns to the question of language in its relation to being as that which constitutes and accomplishes the "humanness" of human being. It is within this context that I will issue Heidegger's statement that "language is the house of (the truth of) being".

Firstly, I claim that Heidegger's statement concerning the "house of being", which is the most significant idea in the letter with regards to the essence of human existence, should not be read as a mere definition of language as discourse [*Rede*]. It must be thought in relation to the "onto-ethical" relationship between being, human being and language. It is "ontological" because it is about the link between being and the essence of human existence. As I will discuss the relation between *ethos*, ethics and dwelling, it is "ethical", as it concerns the way in which human being *inhabits* the world. Yet, it is "ontological" and "ethical" in a way that exceeds the limits of both enterprises. Dwelling (*wohnen,* or as often used in the letter, *aufenthalten*) is an inter-play in which human beings participate,

[190] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 244) However, Heidegger also marks that Marxism, in its reading of the homelessness and estrangement of human being, is a more adequate designation of the human being than other historical interpretations. (p. 258-59.)

[191] I will come back to this topic in two occasions: first, in my discussion of Hodge's critique of Heidegger, and second, in Fell's comparison of Heidegger and Sartre's thought.

as I have shown in the previous chapter with regard to the idea of the fourfold [*Geviert*]. Dwelling means the taking place of the event [*Ereignis*] in the sense of the mutual appropriation and conditioning of the earth, sky, mortals and immortals. The inter-play that dwelling implies the emergence of place as disclosing and gathering, and as I will argue, this is also what Heidegger brings into view with the statement that "language is the house of being".

Wrathall astutely draws attention to the ongoing silence in Heidegger literature regarding Heidegger's "slogan". He writes:

> In secondary literature on Heidegger, the slogan is often invoked but rarely deemed to warrant any kind of extended discussion. Almost everybody acts as if it is immediately apparent what Heidegger is trying to say: they take it as a declaration of the view that the being of entities somehow depends on the linguistic expressions we use in thinking or talking about those entities.[192]

In that framework, Heidegger points out the necessity of a new way of thinking the relationship between language and dwelling:

> The talk about the house of being is not the transfer of the image "house" onto being. But one day we will, by thinking the essence of being in a way appropriate to its matter, more readily be able to think what "house" and "dwelling" are.[193]

Heidegger's argument in that passage shows that the issue requires a more appropriate approach that does not read the statement as a metaphor. This is why I suggest that a topological interpretation of the statement is essential, as it precisely helps us avoid transferring the image of "house" onto being. On the contrary, we must examine what it means for language to be the "house of being" with an analysis that delves into the very

[192] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 120.
[193] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 272)

place-character of house and dwelling, and how the matter is tied to the question of language.

In the history of philosophy, especially since Aristotle, one of the defining characteristics of human beings has been language as discourse, meaning the capacity to speak [*logos*, *Rede*]. This has also been interpreted to mean that human beings possess a faculty of reason [*ratio*] that separates them from other living beings. The ancient Greek word *logos* has a broad range of implications such as language, word, reason, law, and account. As such, Aristotle's designation of human being as "*zoon echon logon*" does not only mean "living being that possesses discourse (or discursive intelligence)". Heidegger initially acknowledges Aristotle's premise that human beings have "*logos*", yet he objects to the way in which we think the relation between the human being and *logos*: "This essential definition of the human being is not false. But it is conditioned by metaphysics".[194] This means that Heidegger does not refute the designation of human being as the "rational animal", but what we mean and understand by it. What does "rationality" mean, especially if it is tied to human being's capacity of speech? In that context, Heidegger argues that if language determines human existence, then, it must rather be language that possesses the human being.

According to Heidegger's account, in the Roman designation of the statement, the Greek word *logos* is reductively translated as *ratio* meaning "reason". Human beings are "rational animals" [*animal rationale*][195], namely animals bestowed with *logos*, for they have bodies just like beasts, but in addition they possess "*ratio*" along with spirit or mind.[196] However, Heidegger's argument is that human beings are not "rational" because they possess faculty of reason, but on the contrary, because they dwell in the openness of

[194] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 246)
[195] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 245)
[196] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 245-246)

being as language, they have access to "rationality". Likewise, human beings are not mere animals with additional intellectual qualities such as mind, spirit, soul or likewise. This would mean to misunderstand both the essence of animality, as well as the being of human beings.

I have mentioned that one of the peculiar characteristics of Roman philosophy is to identify the essence of human existence as *animal rationale*, i.e., rational animal. For Heidegger, Roman philosophy is where we find the origin of the concept of "humanity", interpreted on the basis of Roman ideals of what it means to be a "human". The understanding of human being as rational animal, in turn, is based on a peculiar interpretation of *logos* as *ratio* as reason. Yet, if the validity of the understanding of *logos* as *ratio* becomes questionable, then, the understanding of the human being as the rational animal, as well as the actual meaning of concept of "human" concealed "humanity" also turns out to be problematic. The motive that lies at the bottom of Heidegger's critique of the interpretation of *zoon echon logon* is to refute the designation of the human being solely based on its biological-animalistic nature. This is tied to his disagreement with the view that considers language only as a mean of communication or self-expression. This should not mean that Heidegger ignores the so-called "animalistic" aspects of human existence and the communicative use of language in general; however, in order to find out human beings' particular relation to language, we cannot only focus on the linguistic process of signification and communication. Heidegger objects to the envisioned dualism between the animal as the bodily beast and the human being as the being endowed with spirit, mind, consciousness, and such. Human being is not something more than animal by virtue of its intellectual or spiritual capacities, for this comparison lacks a firm ground as it leaves the "animal" undefined, and imposes a ground of comparison based on *only* what human beings possess and what animals lack, e.g. language as that within which things

appear in terms of their being. Looking into the problem of metaphysics neither allows us to understand the human being, nor the *animalitas* of the "animal".[197] Therefore, we must consider the question of language beyond the linguistic and communicative features of language.

It is within this framework that Heidegger problematizes the relationship between language, dwelling, and place with the statement that "language is the house of being". Heidegger claims: "Language still denies us its essence: that it is the house of the *truth* of being."[198] Here, it is evident that Heidegger does not talk about language as speech or discourse, which for him designates the unity of phoneme, written character, melody, rhythm and meaning.[199] This is the animalistic-metaphysical understanding of language that considers language solely as a means of communication that carries out the transmission and exchange of ideas, emotions, needs, and desires. Indeed, Heidegger does not deny that this register of language is vital for our biological and communal needs; however, it is not the foundational aspect of our relation to language either. The original step in Heidegger's thought is to consider the origin, ground and unfolding of language. This is why Heidegger endeavours to look into the relationship between language and the *truth* of being.

Though I will discuss the term in detail later in the chapter, here I can clarify that the term "truth of being" indicates the ontological event through which the disclosure of the meaning of things takes place. The argument is that language is the primary site within and of which this very emergence takes place. It is also possible to express this idea as follows: the site within which the meaning of things comes to appearance is language. In

[197] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 246)
[198] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 243) Here, it is also noteworthy that Heidegger emphasizes the notion of "truth of being". This is an often overlooked point that needs closer attention, because discussing it will illuminate the ontological relation between the "truth of being" and "place being", which is crucial to understand the conceptual development of Heidegger's later thinking.
[199] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 254)

this second formulation, it becomes even more obvious that language cannot primarily signify speech or communication, but things must issue from the happening of language. Language is the site of interrelatedness and correspondence, and thus provides the possibility to interact with phenomena on a meaningful level. Anything meaningful already exists within the boundaries of language, not necessarily as the space of self-expression and communication, but as the field of the very *possibility* of coming into appearance. Wherever our intelligence finds meaningful, that is, of meaning, we are already moving in the region of language, which itself remains in relation to silence.

In light of these considerations, let me focus on the meaning of "house of being". In Heidegger scholarship, Wrathall draws attention to earlier appearances of the term "house of being" in the history of philosophy. He shows that Heidegger's statement is related to Nietzsche's designation of "house of being". Heidegger must have been familiar with Nietzsche's views on being and language thanks to his Nietzsche lectures in the mid-1930s. Nietzsche writes: "Everything breaks, everything is joined [*gefügt*] anew; the same house of being builds itself eternally. Everything parts, everything greets itself again; the ring of being remains loyal to itself eternally."[200] The word that Nietzsche uses at this instance for 'enjoining' has its origins in the etymologically related German words *Fug* and *Fuge*, which, for Heidegger appears to have broader meanings.[201] According to Heidegger, *Fuge* as "jointure" is what keeps the "house of being" together and renders it as a place of gathering. This means, the characteristic of "relating and keeping together" is one of the most elemental features of Heidegger's statement that has been previously brought up by Nietzsche.

---

[200] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, ed. Adrian Del Naro, trans. Robert B. Pippin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 175.

[201] In his 1946 essay *Anaximander's Saying*, Heidegger translates the ancient Greek word *dike* with the German *Fug,* as 'order', which conventionally means justice or rightfulness. "The jointure belongs to what stays awhile which, in turn, belongs in the jointure. The jointure [*Fuge*] is order [*Fug*]". (*Off the Beaten Track*, 269)

Karl Jaspers was one of the first critics of Heidegger's designation of language as the "house of being".[202] Wrathall reports[203] that in one of his letters to Heidegger, Jaspers maintains the view that language should rather be conceived of as a bridge.[204] This is because, for him, language is the medium of human communication. Here, we must ask whether the notion of "medium" indicates a conception of language as a mere device of communication. Although I have argued that language is the "middle" space, "the between of human being and being, a "means of communication" is not the sense in which the issue can be understood in Heidegger's thought. Only if we understand the "bridge" in the topological sense of the happening of the "between", this would then give us a proper definition of the "medium". In this case, language would mean that which makes the interrelation and interaction between being and human being possible, instead of being the mere tool of communication between individual human beings, as a mere external connector. Therefore the betweenness of language that is at issue is not between human beings, but between being and human being. As such, we need to think the issue in a non-subjectivistic vein. The "house of being" is where the essence of human being (existence) and the event of being come together, gathered in the site opened up in "the between".[205] The "medium" is not that a bridge that human beings make or create, but that which discloses, gathers and makes any experience [*Erfahrung*] possible as a "journeying" in the first place.

The primary implications of the description of the topological essence of language as the "house of being" are the following: as a manifestation of place the "house of

[202] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 135.
[203] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History*, 121
[204] "Karl Jaspers to Heidegger, Letter of August 6, 1949", in Martin Heidegger and Karl Jasper, *Martin Heidegger - Karl Jaspers: Briefwechsel 1920–1963*, ed. Walter Biemel and Hans Saner (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann/München: Piper, 1990), 179.
[205] The between and the middle ground in terms of human understanding and communication is a critical hermeneutic idea for Gadamer, which I discuss in the next chapter.

being", 1) opens up and provides space, 2) safeguards and protects, and 3) gathers and holds together meanings that unfold in it. In other words, language provides things with the possibility of appearing in terms of meaning, and preserves meaning in the space that it opens up for communication. The key point here is that Heidegger considers language as the house of the "truth of being" (*aletheia*).[206] Language is not only a container of meanings where they are preserved and encapsulated as ready-made tag words. Language does not safeguard the meaning of things, but it safeguards the *region* in which phenomena can come to unfold. In other words, instead of constituting a metaphysical "space of meaning", it lets the "presencing" of the meaning of things. That does not mean that language is a subject on its own that can be thought independently of human being. The happening of language must be thought in relation to the event [*Ereignis*]. In effect, language, as the house of truth of being, as well as the happening of place, is precisely the two-fold movement between being and human being. This is precisely where we need to abandon the subjectivistic mode of thinking in associating language with "meaning-making".

Referring to *Being and Time*, Heidegger writes: "That is why we also say (p. 230) that how being, is to be understood chiefly from its "meaning" [*Sinn*], that is, from the truth of being."[207] In this regard Heidegger also claims:

> This abode [truth of being] first yields the experience of something we can hold on to. *The* truth of being offers a hold for all conduct. "Hold" in our language means protective heed. Being is the protective heed that holds the human being in his ek-sistent essence to the truth of such protective heed - in such a way that it houses ek-sistence in language. Thus language is at once the house of being and the home of the human essence. [208]

[206] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 243)
[207] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 257)
[208] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 274)

Here, the crucial point that Heidegger suggests is that language, as the house of truth of being and as the abode of human dwelling, is the ground of "all conduct". It is evident that Heidegger considers language as the house of being, where the belonging together of human being and being "takes place". Another key point in the passage is that Heidegger looks into discussing ethics as *ethos* in relation to the question of language and dwelling. The capacity to understand phenomena as meaningful things via language is the ground of all human "conduct". The simple question *ti esti* "what is" occurs from this place where human beings can comport themselves toward the event through which the unfolding of the meaning of things. Put differently, their nearness to the event in the "there" is what makes human beings the kind of beings that they are. Human beings "act" on the basis of the *essential* character of its *existence*. As such, Heidegger brings up the notion of "action" within the context of the completion of the humanness of human being which appears in the house *of* being, and not in terms of the "making" of the individuals.

The concept of "action" that Heidegger discusses at the outset of his letter is significant, and understanding it would prepare us for better conceiving the discussion on *ethos* and ethics. According to Heidegger, the meaning of "action" should be understood as "fulfilling" and "bringing to completion" [*vollbringen*] rather than "causing a mere effect".[209] It is not the action is that produces the effect, but the action simply allows for an effect to come about by being the medium, providing the space of embodiment. The action is what enables [*vermögt*] in the topological sense of "giving space" where things can emerge and flourish. In that sense, for Heidegger, the meaning of thinking is to "create" with and within language, which is a fundamental action.[210] Put in this way, we may eliminate the envisaged dichotomy between "acting" and "thinking". Those who create with language, such as the poets and thinkers are the guardians of the "house of

[209] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 239)
[210] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 239)

being", which means that they protect the middle space in and through which any thinking can emerge by inhabiting it. In doing so, they fulfil the essence of being a human being simply by "thinking", because thinking is the most fundamental human action in the sense that it is the enabling force of human existence[211], which allows for the possibility of all human "production" to emerge. This means, where there is no thinking, which is undergo an experience with language and journey within its boundaries, there can be no human production either.

The most concrete meaning of this is that the poets preserve the possibility of a new understanding of things to become manifest by virtue of remaining in relation to the event by dwelling in language. For Heidegger, what first and foremost matters is the relation that in which human beings stand to language, and the transformation that our understanding of language must undergo. As such, 1) Insofar as our relation to language is what is at stake, Heidegger's account can be interpreted as "ethics of language", 2) However, the kind of "ethics" that Heidegger's position entails is different from the traditional normative, descriptive or applied ethics that think within the framework of the "human" or "inter-human". Now, we can inquire into the place-nature of Heidegger's "ethics" of language as a questioning on the meaning of being as dwelling in place, by considering language as the primary *ethos* of human existence.

II. 2 "Ethics of Language": Topology of Language

One way of approaching the "Letter on Humanism" is by focusing on Heidegger's discussion of ethics, in specific with a concentration on the significance of *ethos* as

[211] "Thinking does not become action only because some effect issues from it or because it is applied. Thinking acts insofar as it thinks. Such action is presumably the simplest and at the same time the highest because it concerns the relation of being to humans." ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 239)

dwelling place. An investigation concerning the meaning of *ethos* is key to understand what the essence of language amounts to in Heidegger's "onto-ethical" approach. Heidegger argues:

> If then, in accordance with the basic meaning of the word *ethos*, the name 'ethics' says that it considers the true habitation of human beings [*Aufenthalt des Menschen*], then that thinking which thinks the truth of being as the primary element of human beings, as something which exists, is already an originary ethics. [212]

This is the key point in Heidegger's thought concerning the meaning of ethics as *ethos.* It allows us to see the basis of his topological turn in examining language that becomes explicit with the statement that language is the "house of the truth of being". This is because the statement is about the dwelling (habitation) of human existence within the boundaries of language. One of the least discussed aspects of Heidegger's ideas in the "Letter on Humanism" is the way in which he distinguishes "*ethos*" from "ethics". The very basis of his thought on ethics is that he considers human conduct not on the basis of moral principles and "oughts".

Another philosopher that comes to mind in terms of the critique of the "ought" is Hegel. He challenged the prioritization of "ought" in Kant's deontology that thematizes the moral duties of any rational being on the basis of formal, universal principles of action attained by the faculty of practical reason. However, Heidegger's understanding of ethics still vastly differs from that of Hegel's, even if both seem to go against a deontological mode of thinking. For Hegel, any discussion of ethics must start by analysing customary forms of life that exist one's society. The key term for Hegel is *Sittlichkeit*, which is distinct from *Moralität*. In a certain sense, the distinction between the two is similar to the difference between "ethics" and "morality". Bernard Williams argues that while the

[212] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 271)

former is more about the individual disposition and habit, the latter is about the application and the results of one's actions for and within the society.[213] We cannot suggest that some actions or dispositions are "moral", yet any action or disposition with moral qualities is always already ethical.

In that context, we can ask the following question: what is the overall foundation of ethical theories, if there are any? What are their basic characteristics? The answer that Williams gives allows us to distinguish Heidegger's position from traditional ethical frameworks. I consider the criteria that Williams mentions are sufficiently valid for identifying the fundamental framework of paradigmatic ethical theories, and thus it can guide us in determining whether Heidegger's position could be called "ethical" in the conventional sense of the term, and if not, why so. Accordingly, an ethical theory usually attempts to answer to the originally Socratic question "What should I do", in thematizing and signifying, 1) obligation or duty, 2) actions and dispositions that issue from virtues, as well as the moral development of these virtues.[214] In Heidegger's thought of *ethos*, however, there is neither a sense of *Sittlichkeit* nor *Moralität* in the traditional sense of the terms. For Heidegger, both the "virtue" and "duty" of human existence must be conceived in non-subjectivistic frames, only in relation to one's bond to the event [*Ereignis*], which itself is not an entity or agent, but a happening that is beyond human control and making, one in which human being partakes insofar it "has" (dwells in) language. The most fundamental action on the part of human beings is the occurrence of "self-relating" to the event [*Ereignis*] via thinking, which takes place in and through language as the "house of the truth of being". It is this originary action, which situates the human being in its belonging dwelling place.

---

[213] Bernard Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (London & New York: Routledge, 2006), 6.
[214] Bernard Williams, *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy* (London & New York: Routledge, 2006), 8-9.

A new understanding of "ethics" requires a reconsideration of our relation to language, which itself requires an understanding of the place-character of *ethos.* This is because only in doing so we can problematize the question of ethics as the question of dwelling. In this way, the issue of "action" can be brought up in a more fundamental way. But can we call this "ethics" in the way it has been traditionally understood among philosophers? Based on Williams' definition of an ethical theory, Heidegger's thought appears outside of the confines traditional ethical theories. Another question in that regard is the following: in trying to lay out the possibility of a new understanding of "ethics", does Heidegger's thought hold a meta-ethical position? The answer to that question depends on what we mean by "meta-ethics". If the term "meta-ethics" signifies the sub-discipline of ethics that attempts to ground the nature and validity of ethical judgements, we must admit that Heidegger's thought does not have much to do with "meta-ethics". Meta-ethics is generally defined as the kind of enterprise that asks, "what is the meaning of a good action", instead of asking, "what should I do" (normative ethics). On the other hand, if meta-ethics could be defined as the attempt to reposition the discipline of ethics as such, it would be possible to say that Heidegger does some sort of "meta-metaethics". However, again, this would be a very idiosyncratic definition of "meta-ethics".[215]

First and foremost, we should bear in mind that Heidegger wants to provide a new ground of ethics (as well "ontology" and "logic", and for thinking in general), not a new theory within the already existing frameworks of ethics. In the "Letter on Humanism", Heidegger offers a topological perspective to achieve that. Here, I use the word

[215] I find it relevant when Sheehan argues: "Heidegger's question, on the other hand, is *meta*-metaphysical: it takes a further step. beyond realness/*ousia* itself. μετὰ τὴν φύσιν εἰς τὸ "X." Metaphysics asks: "How come beings"? whereas Heidegger asks, "How come being_—that is meaningful presence at all?" *in* Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 68.
Likewise, Heidegger's meta-metaethical position is that he questions the ground from which any possibility of ethics emerges. He does not ask the meaning (or validity) of certain actions, but problematizes the presencing of any meaningful action.

"topological" with an eye to underscore the place-related underpinnings of the Greek notion of *ethos* as dwelling-place. Heidegger suggests: "Ethics means dwelling place, abode. The word names the open region in which human being dwells."[216] In this alternative understanding of "ethics", the term "open region" indicates the *ethos* of human existence, which means human being's situatedness in language. A topological understanding of ethics means engaging with the place-character of human existence, meaning its open and finite nature as the "there" [*Da*] which grounds the happening of being [*Sein*]. In that regard, the principle idea is that language is the dwelling-place of the essence of human beings (existence).[217] In Heidegger scholarship, Malpas draws our attention to how a topological manner of thinking would help us to understand the core matter of Heidegger's ethics. He argues:

> The "ethics" at issue is not one that consists in the establishment of certain rules for conduct or in the uncovering of certain basic ethical "principles." It is instead the "ethics" that speaks of the need to respond to the proper "*ethos*" of human being—an ethics that is given essentially in the form of dwelling.[218]

In that line of thinking, let me first focus on the meaning and implications of *ethos* before I deal with the link between *ethos*, language and human existence. In the history of philosophy, the connection between place and *ethos* is well documented. Philosophers have marked the understanding of ethics of *ethos* as inhabitation and dwelling-place since antiquity. Although it is indeed possible to engage with the issue by revisiting Aristotle,

---

[216] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 269)

[217] He suggests: "The tragedies of Sophocles - provided such a comparison is at all permissible - preserve the *ethos* in their sayings more primordially than Aristotle's lectures on "ethics." A saying of Heraclitus that consists of only three words says something so simply that from it the essence of ethos immediately comes to light." ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 269) This passage attests to the accuracy of having discussed Sophocles' *Antigone* and Hölderlin's "The Ister" in terms of dwelling, habituation, and *ethos* as I have displayed in the previous chapter.

[218] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 277.

Heidegger shows that the understanding of *ethos* as dwelling-place has played an even more crucial role for the "pre-Socratic"[219] thinker Heraclitus.

To discuss the meaning of *ethos* and how it differs from our traditional understanding of ethics, Heidegger mentions one of Heraclitus' well-known fragments, where he captures a similar understanding of *ethos* as dwelling-place. "The saying of Heraclitus (Fragment 119) reads: *ethos antropo daimon.* This is usually translated "A man's character is his *daimon*."" According to Heidegger, this translation does not show us the most significant aspect of the fragment,[220] because it is a subjectivist interpretation of the statement, which focuses on the human, but not on the topological meaning of *ethos*[221]. That said, Krell's way of taking up the notion of *daimon* via Platon's *Symposium* as the dweller of the *between*, namely, between the mortals and the mortals, can also point out the topological aspects of the issue.

The English version of Heidegger's translation in German underscores the topological underpinnings of the saying: "The (familiar) abode for humans is the open region for the presenting of god (the unfamiliar one).[222] Accordingly, *ethos,* in the

---

[219] Although it is fairly common to refer to Heraclitus and Parmenides as "pre-Socratic" thinkers, such designation and classification of the history of philosophy is biased in its prioritizing of the thought of Socrates and Platon.

[220] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 269)

[221] Krell provides a detailed analysis of the issue in relation to Heraclitus' story that Heidegger borrows from Aristotle, where a very similar understanding of *ethos* comes to the fore, yet at the same time, it also bring into view the ways in which the question of "life" is pushed to the background. According to Krell, this is the weak point of Heidegger's thought itself, especially when thought within the context of his politics. David F Krell, *The Daimon Life*: *Heidegger and Life Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 1-4.

[222] At this point, one might wonder whether Heidegger completely left behind the subject of "divinities" that played such a major role in his elaborations on the essence of poetry in early 1930s and 1940s. In his 1946 essay "Why Poets?", he remarks: "Being, as itself, spans its own province, which is marked off *(temnein, tempus)* by Being's being present in the word. Language is the precinct *(templum),* that is, the house of Being." Here Heidegger's slogan is formulated in a different way, but again, in topological terms. It is noticeable from the way that Heidegger deploys the German word *Bezirk*, or Ancient Greek and Latin *templum*, he does not mean the language of everydayness. A precinct is in each and every case a very precise region, since it is demarcated and cut off from a more encompassing space. Heidegger here wants to point out the necessity of a poetic relation to the house of being. The problems that he engages with in the "Letter on Humanism" do not allow him to problematize the nature of divinities, yet this does not mean that

broadest sense of the word, indicates the way in which one's habits emerge through one's way of dwelling-habituation. What is the relation between habit and place that makes Heidegger's account topological? Inhabiting a place allows one to develop a character that results from that very way of orienting oneself in "there". In other words, habits are consequences of our relation to the happening of the contexts in which we exist. In a certain sense, a habit appears insofar as it is a result of the correspondence and interplay between one's being-there (one's situated essence) and the "*there*" [*Da*] itself, (the place where one is situated). Just as habits are not merely repeated random actions, they are not character traits that we can change at will either. The relationship between *ethos* as "character" and *ethos* as "dwelling place" is something Jean-Luc Nancy also considers:

> Presence and disposition: sojourn and comportment, these are the senses of the two Greek words *ēthos* and *ethos*, which contaminate each other in the motif of a stand, a "self-standing" that is at the root of all ethics. In a different manner yet oddly analogous, the Latin terms *habitare* and habitus come from the same *habere*, which means first "standing" and "self-standing," to occupy a place, and from this to possess and to have (habitudo had meant a "manner of relating to ... "). It is a having with a sense of being: it is a manner of being there and of standing in it. A world is an ethos, a habitus and an inhabiting: it is what holds to itself and in itself, following to its proper mode.[223]

Baracchi's interpretation of the concept of "*ethos*" in Aristotle supports Heidegger and Nancy's position:

> The word *ethos* signifies precisely disposition, character in the sense of psychological configuration, and hence comportment, the way in which one bears oneself. However, the semantic range of the term exceeds this determination and signals that it must be situated in the broader context of custom, of shared usage, and even understood in the archaic but abiding sense of the accustomed place

---

this dimension of his thought disappears. On the contrary, at the end of 1940s and the beginning of 1950s, the questions of divinities come to the fore again, in an even more consolidated manner.

[223] Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Creation of the World or Globalization*, trans. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: SUNY Press, 2007), 42.

where the living (animals, plants, or otherwise) find their haunt or abode.[224]

Baracchi continues her argument by saying: "Finally, *ethos* names the exquisitely human abode – most basically, but not only, in the sense of the land in which a people settles, the geo-political space in which a community is as such constituted and lives".[225] What precisely needs to be emphasized at this point is that Heidegger understands *ethos* not in the usual geo-political sense of the word. The emphasis is not on particular, so to say, ontic locations, but on the happening of place as dwelling-place as such. According to Baracchi's interpretation of the Aristotelian understanding of *ethos*, customary ways of being-with as dis-positions[226] already establish an "ethics" insofar as they create a context and certain relations of reciprocity. This, however, does not mean that just by being the kind of beings that we are, we, individually or collectively, possess some sort of a pre-established morality, nor should it mean that the kind of "dwelling" we possess could be morally justified. Yet, an originary "ethics", in considering the meaning of human customs and character via the question of existence already bring into view the definition of a human being.[227] Now, from an Aristotelian perspective, the most significant and essential character of human being is its political being. Indeed, Aristotle names the human a political animal in the book one of his *Politics*, but on the grounds that human

[224] Claudia Baracchi, *Aristotle's Ethics as First Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 53.
[225] Claudia Baracchi, *Aristotle's Ethics as First Philosophy*, 54.
[226] There is a curious etymological connection between the Greek *ethos*, and Latin *habitus*, *disposition*, as disposition literally means "act of placing here and there", deriving from Latin *disponere*. Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language*. (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 219.
[227] For instance, according to Nussbaum, this brings us to the evaluation problem, in that we have to evaluate on what grounds we will define the human being, which characteristics of being human we will consider to be the most essential ones without which we could not continue to exist as human beings. Martha C. Nussbaum, "Aristotle on Human Nature and the Foundations of Ethics, with an Addendum", in *The Bloomsbury Companion to Aristotle*, ed. Claudia Baracchi, (London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2014), 199.

beings have *logos*.[228] If the most fundamental characteristic of human existence is its communal dwelling, and if this depends on its access to language, then, does not a sound "ethical" theory, which seeks to understand the basics of human dwelling, first and foremost needs to attempt to ponder what it means for human beings to have language? It is in this vein of thinking that Heidegger can go on to say that "this is not ethics in the first instance because it is ontology".[229] This is a form of "onto-logy" that inquires into the question of language, and its relation to being and dwelling as the source of the presencing of beings. Furthermore, the question of language does not only come up within the context of communication and self-expression, but as that which opens up any field of understanding, which translates into meaningful action and articulation.

II. 3 Heidegger and Ethics

I will now move on to Hodge's discussion of Heidegger's ethics. Like many other critics of Heidegger, Hodge focuses on Heidegger's negligence of moral problems. Heidegger's infamous affiliation with the Nazi party in 1933 has been a major source of suspicion towards the possibility of a Heideggerian "ethics". Heidegger's short-lived turn to the idea of "people" [*Volk*] reinforced the conviction that his thought carries traces of National Socialist ideology. Furthermore, in light of the recently published *Black Notebooks*, it is evident that Heidegger was, somehow, not able to see beyond certain stereotypes about Jews (though we must also ask whether what is at issue was always an underdeveloped and never fully established critique of the "mono-theism" that is at issue in Judaism,

[228] *Politics*, Book I: 1253a1-18
[229] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 271)

Christianity, and even Islam). Although these charges must be taken very seriously[230] and even if Heidegger the person may have failed in some of his personal relationships and political engagements, Heidegger the thinker's understanding of *ethos* still can provide us with significant insights into the essence of ethics.

Despite Heidegger's bad reputation on the issue, there are several important works that examine Heidegger's ethics. Hodge's *Heidegger and Ethics* (1996)[231] stands out as one of the very first critical works engaging with the matter at length. Frederick Olafson, William McNeill and Michael Lewis also review the question of ethics and the role it plays in Heidegger's overall thinking.[232] As can be observed in Olafson and Lewis' works, there is a tendency to take the notion of "being-with" [*Mitsein*] as the starting point of Heidegger's ethics. It is true that the notion of "being-with" from *Being and Time* is the closest conceptualization of Heidegger of a theory of inter-subjectivity, namely, the ground for the inter-action of human beings with one another. Yet, as Lewis also points out[233], the issue is also connected to the "being-with" of human being and beings. Departing from the notion of "being-with" risks covering over the significance of Heidegger's thinking on the meaning of ethics, because it sets out to think within conventional frameworks.

Lewis' account acutely overcomes these difficulties as a result of his explicit focus on the notion of the event [*Ereignis*]. His recognition of the limitations of Heidegger's early thought regarding the "ontological difference" of *Being and Time* allows him to move beyond the mere subjectivistic understanding of "being-with". In mentioning the

[230] For detailed discussions of Heidegger's ethics and politics, see: Bernhard Radloff, *Heidegger and the Question of National Socialism: Disclosure and Gestalt*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002; Frank Schalow, *Language and Deed: Rediscovering Politics through Heidegger's Encounter with German Idealism*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.
[231] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics,* London & New York: Routledge, 1996.
[232] Frederick A. Olafson, *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998; William McNeill, *The Time of Life: Heidegger and Ēthos*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006; Michael Lewis, *Heidegger and the Place of Ethics*. London & New York: Continuum, 2006.
[233] Michael Lewis, *Heidegger and the Place of Ethics*, 3.

relation between the event [*Ereignis*] and the fourfold, Lewis is able to thematize a sense of "being-with" that exceeds the human and inter-human. He explicitly acknowledges the fact that in Heidegger, *ethos* amounts to dwelling, yet dwelling is dwelling with the "other".[234] The "other", however does not necessarily indicate other human beings, but rather things, as well as immortals, sky and earth. Likewise, his response to the Levinasian critique of Heidegger in not prioritizing ethics over ontology does justice to the fact that Heidegger wishes to de-structure the relation between ontology and ethics, and not to prioritize one over the other.

One problematic aspect of Lewis' approach in general is that he takes the "place" of ethics as a rethinking of "being-with", without giving an account of what "place" means. Although Lewis states that it is not possible to think or understand Heidegger's thought on ethics (and politics) without considering "being-with"[235], this argument needs to be developed. First of all, "being-with" in the sense of the gatheredness of being, human being and things (or the components of the fourfold) via the event, already presupposes an understanding of place. Place is indeed that at which the "with" [*mit*] of "Being-with" [*Mitsein*] can have a ground so that it can stand upon and where things can be interrelated and gathered together. This is language in the sense that it is the between of human being and being, namely the house of being, that without which being and human being cannot come to correspond. This is why Heidegger's thinking on ethics needs to be seen in its relation the question of language, even if we start from the notion of "being-with".

In order to clarify Heidegger's thought on ethics, I will now first discuss the plausibility of the standard criticism directed at him. This is the reason why I prefer to take issue with Hodge's position in her *Heidegger and Ethics*. Hodge's account is two-

[234] Michael Lewis, *Heidegger and the Place of Ethics*, 6.
[235] Michael Lewis, *Heidegger and the Place of Ethics*, 161.

fold. Firstly, she claims that the strict ontological underpinnings of Heidegger's thought lead him to underestimate the significance of ethical questions. (Olafson, for instance, defended the ontological basis of Heidegger's ethics). In that regard, Hodge's main argument is the following: Heidegger falls short of the full potential of his own anti-metaphysical agenda by proposing to step back into the ground of metaphysics, while failing to raise the following question: what is ethics?[236] I contest this idea by arguing that Heidegger effectively problematizes the ground of ethics by interrogating the essence of language and dwelling. Secondly, Hodge has a positive view of Heidegger's ethics. She suggests that Heidegger's statement that language is the house of being can actually be thought from an ethical point of view.[237] As a matter of fact, she explains in six steps why Heidegger's ethical thinking has not been well recognized in Heidegger scholarship. I think the second and third points are the most important:

> First, there is the failure to distinguish between producing universal principles, which for the purposes of this discussion has been called moral reflection, and the broader concern with human relations, both self-to-self and self-to-others […] since Heidegger is evidently not producing universalisable moral principles, it is falsely assumed he cannot be concerned with ethics. Second, Heidegger claims his enquiries are not concerned with ethics, because his notion of ethics is restricted to inter-human relations and does not include the relation between human beings and the contexts in which they find themselves.[238]

These are two of Hodge's arguments in claiming that Heidegger actually offers a model of ethical theory in *Being and Time*. According to Hodge, Heidegger's way of thinking of ethics opens up the possibility of thematizing the "broader concern with human relations self-to-self and self-to-others", yet Heidegger's subsequent thought fails to achieve this. The reason why this is the case is that Heidegger's thought always remained influenced by

[236] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 3.
[237] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics*, 40.
[238] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics*, 203.

his earlier project of "fundamental ontology", which resulted in his "repression" of ethics. This is an argument that Heidegger refutes in the letter[239] by pointing out what Lewis suggests: "Fundamental ontology" was a provisional way of entering the discussion of the relation between being, human being and things. Insofar as it took for granted the "ontological difference" between being [*Sein*] and beings [*Seiende*], it remained groundless. What provides this ground is the notion of the event [*Ereignis*] (which is the basis of the idea of the fourfold), because it precisely explains how being and beings are appropriated to one another in the clearing [*Lichtung*] and truth of being (*aletheia*), which, in turn, takes place *in* and *as* language, in the sense of the place of the meaningful presencing of things. Furthermore, even if Heidegger seems to never give up on the ontological priority of his questioning, this could be the case if and only if he insisted on seeing "being" strictly as part of an ontological discourse. For Heidegger, doing ethics does not necessitate distinguishing action from being. The thinking of being, which Heidegger describes as the "quiet power" of the favouring-enabling, that is, of the "possible", is already thinking the ground upon which human beings act.[240] This view rejects the dualism between *actus* and *potentia.* We cannot understand potentiality separate from acting and actuality, if that which allows for an action to take place is being as the enabling force.

Positioning herself against Heidegger, Hodge claims that Heidegger's later thought is a kind of "ontology", one that still ventures to repress "ethics" as such.[241]. In Hodge's explanations, one distinction is important. She distinguishes moral reflection that she attributes to Kant from ethical reflection that she attributes to Aristotle. In the former, we concern ourselves with the universal principles and criteria of judgment, while in the latter

[239] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 271)
[240] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 241)
[241] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 231)

we focus on the formation of one's character [*ethos*].[242] Accordingly, the fact that Heidegger is not interested in moral reflection does not entail that his thinking is not ethical. Heidegger wrote the "Letter on Humanism" only a year after the end of the Second World War. This is the commencement of the heyday of political activism in Europe, in particular, with an eye to causing an immediate effect in the aftermath of the destruction that the war caused. Heidegger's letter can also be regarded as an implicit response to that movement in thinking. Heidegger writes:

> Soon after *Being and Time* appeared a young friend asked me, ''when are you going to write an ethics?'' Where the essence of the human being is thought so essentially, i.e., solely from the question concerning the truth of being, and yet without elevating the human being to the centre of beings, a longing necessarily awakens for a peremptory directive and for rules that say how the human being, experienced from ek-sistence toward being, ought to live in a fitting manner. The desire for an ethics presses ever more ardently for fulfilment as the obvious no less than the hidden perplexity of human beings soars to immeasurable heights.[243]

As we can see in that passage, the kind of criticism that Hodge directs to Heidegger is not unanticipated for Heidegger. In that regard, Nancy also draws attention to what Heidegger's thought states: "if the essence of human beings is grounded in language, then the question of being would have to precede ethics, physics and logic. The question of being can be only adequately posed on the basis of an amended relationship through language[244]", which already requires a different engagement with the entire "human situation". Contending Heidegger in the Hodge way does for not looking further into the question of ethics in terms of the "inter-human" is not different from blaming Heidegger for not being a speech therapist. One may argue that this will not do away with the charge that Heidegger neglects moral questions, and since Heidegger has no interest in normative

[242] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 22.
[243] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 268)
[244] Jean-Luc Nancy, "Heidegger's Originary Ethics", in *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, ed. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002), 83–84.

ethics, this is bad for Heidegger's philosophical legacy. Or else, it is also possible to say that an implicit form of normative ethics follows from Heidegger's view. For instance, the destruction of our habitat is wrong precisely because it destroys our humanity. Nevertheless, the case that Heidegger is trying to make is exactly the following: what is destroying our humanity cannot be identified with a normative approach.

It seems that the core issue of Hodge's criticism of Heidegger also concerns how Heidegger wants to interpret his own work. In that sense, Hodge proposes to refute Heidegger's stipulations about his own work and suggests, "I defend Heidegger's earlier view of philosophy against the later one by disputing his identification of philosophy with metaphysics"[245]. In contrast, while upholding the possibility that in *Being and Time* Heidegger was already going beyond his metaphysical inclinations, I essentially defend Heidegger's later view of "philosophy" against his earlier "practice" of it on the basis of the "ethical" human situation of our time: our homelessness in the age of technological advent, which first needs to be properly experienced in and through the question of language and dwelling.

In more recent literature, Braver draws attention to the fact that Heidegger's originary ethics must be seen as an innovative account of ethics, one that problematizes the *dwelling place* of human beings.[246] Braver argues that Heidegger's originary ethics can also be called "perfectionist ethics", one that Heidegger borrows from Aristotle. Braver writes: "The idea is that once we find our essence or what makes us distinctive (our *ergon*), the best way of living consists in performing this activity with excellence (*arete*)".[247] It could be argued that Heidegger develops the Aristotelian underpinnings of ethics with a topological focus. However, for Aristotle, ethics is about individuals' moral

[245] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 18.
[246] Lee Braver, *Heidegger's Later Writings: A Reader's Guide* (London: Continuum, 2009), 67.
[247] Lee Braver, *Heidegger's Later Writings: A Reader's Guide*, 67.

character and human happiness [*eudaimonia*]. In other words, it is a subject-oriented ethics, as it examines the most reasonable actions and habits to be mastered of the individual in actualizing the best version of one's self as human being. Now, on the other hand, the "ethics" that Heidegger advocates, is a being-oriented "ethics". This does not mean that the good life or happiness of the agent drops out of the picture, but the "good life" becomes conceivable insofar as human beings maintain their relation to being.[248] A proper understanding and experience of being is what situates the human existence in its belonging place: language. Humans' *relation* to language is what they must perfect, for this is the home in which they can bring out the most significant possibilities of being a human being. In effect, for Heidegger, thinking means maintaining this relation to being. Yet, thinking does not simply mean disengaged reflection or theoretical contemplation. A human being that "thinks" does not imply a disengaged agent that sits at his table all day long and ponders about the meaning of being. Insofar as one partakes in a meaningful correspondence with things by means of one's actions, one already stands in a relationship with being and language. Heidegger's point is that we reach such an understanding of language only after having experienced it not by means of "philosophy of language", which results in the objectification of language as an entity, but by means of poetic thinking. This is why, in the letter, he insists upon Hölderlin's line: "Full of merit, yet poetically, man dwells upon this earth."[249] Therefore, the fact that language is the house of truth of being is related to the fact that "ethics of language" can be mainly accessed by a poetic mode of thinking. Thinking language in these terms can help us to understand what it means to dwell in the "house of being".

[248] As Lewis calls it, being is the void (or abyss) among beings that has a certain effect on them. Michael Lewis, *Heidegger and the Place of Ethics*, (London & New York: Continuum, 2006), 3.
[249] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 272)

From the perspective of traditional moral philosophy, the main issue with Heidegger's proposed "ethics" is that we cannot address more practical and concrete issues that belong to our everyday lives. I think Hodge is certainly right in asserting that. That said, Heidegger's thought attempts to show forth a new paradigm of thought in which we can re-examine our place in the world, which indicates a new way of *being*, other than proposing a philosophical framework in which we could theoretically address ethical issues in a cause-effect scheme. This is why Heidegger would not accept Hodge's criticism, not because Hodge is wrong in saying that Heidegger cannot address "practical" and "ethical" issues of inter-subjectivity, but because Hodge does not want to acknowledge that Heidegger is not interested in supplying this demand. He writes:

> The beginnings of that interpretation reach back to Plato and Aristotle. They take thinking itself to be a *techne*, a process of deliberation in service to doing and making. But here deliberation is already seen from the perspective of *praxis* and *poiesis*. For this reason thinking, when taken for itself, is not "practical." The characterization of thinking as *theoria* and the determination of knowing as "theoretical" comportment occur already within the "technical" interpretation of thinking.[250]

In view of this, Hodge states that Heidegger's language as the "house of being" can be conceived of as an ethics, because language itself is a "form of life".[251] This is a significant premise that Hodge does not discuss at length. Furthermore, when Hodge mentions language, she considers the linguistic register of language as discourse. However, the subject requires a discussion of the topological essence of language and its place-character that defines the dwelling place of human beings. For Heidegger, the essential "interaction" and relationship is the one that takes place between human beings and being, not between human beings. When he ventures to discuss the "existence" of

[250] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 240)
[251] Joanna Hodge, *Heidegger and Ethics* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 40.

human beings, the focus of his discussions is not the individual as *ego*: "[e]xistence here is not the actuality of the *ego cogito*. Neither is it the actuality of subjects who act with and for each other and so become who they are."[252] Human beings interact with one another on the basis of their implicit understanding and experience of being because this is simply how things appear meaningful to them. To that end, Heidegger problematizes the essence of action and proposes a more encompassing definition that is inclusive of the link between language and action.[253]

We are accustomed to conceive of actions in terms of the cause-effect relationship. Accordingly, the subject performs an action in order to do this or that, which results in certain effects. When the subject achieves to cause the anticipated effect, this appears to be an individual accomplishment. However, as I have explained, Heidegger aims to review the very meaning of "accomplishment" [*vollbringen*], which is where we should try to find out a different understanding of action. Heidegger argues, "[…] yet thinking never creates the house of being. Thinking conducts historical eksistence, that is, the *humanitas* of *homo humanitas,* into the realm of the upsurgence of healing [*des Heilen*].[254] The kind of "activity" that is at stake does not create an effect or an immediate change in the course of things, yet it is that on the grounds of which any action becomes possible. If we change our "relation" toward things, then the interaction in which we partake will also be different. We must reorient ourselves in the "house of being", where a different relation to language may appear, as the happening of the between of being and human being, which will result in a different relation to reality as well.

Within that framework, Heidegger's thought on being cannot be seen as a mere ontology in the traditional sense of the notion. Insofar as it thinks the relationship between

[252] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 261)
[253] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 239)
[254] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 272)

being and human beings, it is a thinking that goes beyond the confines of ontology and ethics. This is a considerable idea that Jean-Luc Nancy also defended:

> By claiming the title "original ethics," and by identifying it with a "fundamental ontology" prior to all of the ontological and ethical partitions of philosophy, Heidegger cannot but have kept deliberately quiet about the only major work of philosophy, Ethics, which is an "ontology" as well as a "logic" and an "ethics". [255]

It is an originary ethics, in the sense that it ponders the origin of the relationship between being and human being with regards to place, namely, the house of truth of being. This relationship that is at issue is nothing but dwelling. Now, having clarified the issue at hand concerning Heidegger's standpoint vis-à-vis "ethics', let me elaborate on the idea of the truth of being and its topological relation to language as the site of the disclosure of being.

II. 4 Existence, the There and Language

Although I have mentioned the relation between the place of human existence – as the "there" [*Da*] – and language, the issue requires a closer scrutiny. Doing so will help discuss the topological underpinnings of Heidegger's "ethics of language" and how it links up with the notion of *aletheia*. According to Heidegger, in order to understand the meaning of dwelling place (*ethos*), we should look into the relationship between being, human being and language. He writes, "and so it is proper to think the essence of language from its correspondence to being and indeed as this correspondence, that is, as the home of the human being." [256]. Heidegger calls it a correspondence, since the relation between human being and being is what constitutes the site of nearness in which dwelling takes

[255] Jean-Luc Nancy, "Heidegger's Originary Ethics", in *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, ed. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002), 84.
[256] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 254)

place. I have argued that the middle space, or the interval, is the between [*das Zwischen*] where the correspondence of being and human being comes to occur as the event [*Ereignis*]. In the support of this reading, Heidegger argues in the letter: "Rather, before all this, the human being in his essence is ek-sistent into the openness of being, into the open region that first clears the 'between' within which a 'relation' of subject to object can 'be'".[257]As such, the openness of being that is at issue first and foremost means the "there" [*Da*] of the *existence* of human beings.

What is existence? Krell describes the rich etymological background of the notion in relation to the "ecstatic" nature of temporality:

> Whence the terms Ekstase, ekstatikon, derived from the verb existanai, *existemi* "to displace," in Heidegger's analysis of temporality? His own etymology, the reference to *Existenz* and *ex(s)istere*, "to stand out," is hardly the place to terminate the discussion. True, the words "existence" and "ecstacy" share the same root: *sto*, "stare" derives from the Greek sta- *histemi* ("to set," "to place"), the Sanskrit *sthâ*, *sthalam* meaning "locus" or "place". The Latin *ex(s)isto* or *ex(s)to* has an extensive history: in Livy, Cicero, and Augustine it means "to step out" "to come forth," "emerge," "appear": in Lucretius, Caesar, and Cicero "to spring," "proceed," "arise", "become".[258]

It is within this context that the topological meaning of existence comes to the fore, which is a crucial point in the letter: Ek-sistence is standing in the clearing [*Lichtung*] of being, which is the way of being of the human being.[259] Language is the dwelling-place that gathers being and human being in the site of being as the there [*Da*], where the movement (the presencing of the sense of beings) from being to human being and vice versa can take place as the event. Heidegger states: "[h]uman being is the being whose being as ek-sistence consists in his dwelling in the nearness of being. The human being is the

[257] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 266)
[258] David F. Krell, *Intimations of Mortality* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986), 54.
[259] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 247)

neighbour of being."[260] Therefore, the topological inquiry concerning being implicates a questioning as to how human beings inhabit that nearness within the "there" [*das Da*], as language.

Language, as the "house of being" and the dwelling-place of human beings, implicates the idea of "there" in relation to the essence of "human existence" as *D*a-sein. We could also simply say "existence", instead of "human existence", because for Heidegger "existence" specifically indicates the way of being of human beings, which in that topological sense also means, their "situated being" in facing the manifestation of being. For Heidegger, "existence" does not mean the presence of any entity in the world, as it has a very specific meaning in terms of the link between the "world" and "presencing". In everyday life when we say that "the tree exists", we do so without giving much thought to the different ways of being present in the world. The sentence "the tree exists" means that the tree is present, simply that the tree is there. However, here the *physis* (as the way of being and occurring) of being-there does not become an issue. We consider the tree only as a real object that appears before us. The literal way of designating the essence of the presence of the tree would be: The tree *trees*, that is, the tree appears and exists in the way a tree does to which we have limited access within the boundaries of our human way of being present. Heidegger argues: "The human being occurs essentially in such a way that he is the 'there' [*das 'Da'*], that is, the clearing of being. The 'being' of the *Da*, and only it, has the fundamental character of ek-sistence, that is, of an ecstatic inherence in the truth of being."[261] Human beings have a very specific relation to the "world", in that, the world as the "there" [*Da*] appears not only as some container in which beings are present. Accordingly, Heidegger suggests, "For us 'world' does not at all signify beings or any realm of being but the openness of being. The human being is, and is

[260] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 261)
[261] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 248)

human, insofar as he is the ek-sisting one. He stands out into the openness of being."[262] This is the "being" of human being, which means, "existing", and as such, human being understands other beings as "existing" beings as well.

One of the most important discussions with respect to the topological relation between the "truth of being", language, place, and existence can be found in Sheehan's interpretation of Heidegger. Although Sheehan does not acknowledge the topological orientation (or at least the topological consequences) of his own thinking, I will show how he thinks in space and place related terms and notions, though without providing an analysis of these place related terms and notions. In that context, let us remember Sheehan's major argument.

There are numerous explicit topological (place-related) concepts in Sheehan's analysis of Heidegger. Only a few examples: "field", "place" [*topos*], "openness", "clearing", "the thrown open clearing", "the open region of understanding", "the realm of disclosedness". A very clear example can be found in the following formulation, where Sheehan compares early and late Heidegger: "His earlier work stressed *ex-sistence* insofar as its thrownness has always already opened up the clearing and holds it open (*Da-sein*), whereas his later work stressed the *clearing as held open* by thrown-open ex-sistence (*Da-sein*)."[263] In the second part of the sentence, Sheehan emphasizes the word *Da* [there], which he understands as the "openness" or the "clearing" within which the sense of things appears for human intelligence. He explicitly claims that the "sought-for" of Heidegger's thinking is not only the "*whence"* of beings, but "whence and how is there the open".[264] In other words, Heidegger asks concerning the site of being (meaning, sense), by bringing to the fore the astonishing fact that things are accessible to us as meaningful things. Our

[262] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 266)
[263] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 22.
[264] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 69.

access to the meaning of things is a result of our appropriated [*Er-eignet*] situatedness-existence as the openness of being. This is the meaning of "*Da*" as the there, which defines the essence/existence of human beings [*Da-sein*].

Sheehan offers that what makes any understanding of being (meaningful presence [*Anwesen*]) possible is the "thrown-open" existential structure of human being's being in the world. "Thrown-open" signifies the there [*Da*] that within the boundaries of which human beings find themselves projected into their futures, making sense of things. There can be no intelligence of phenomena if human beings do not possess the kind of hermeneutic directedness towards things. This hermeneutic capacity is the essential part of what makes human beings the kind of beings they are. This implies that for Heidegger, the actual matter of thinking was a thinking of *that source from which* any understanding of being becomes possible, and not being itself as an agent of entity. This means that being as presence was not what Heidegger was after. Furthermore, being is a word that Heidegger should have dropped from his philosophical terminology long ago. Being means "sense" [*Sinn*], or "disclosedness-to-understanding", and the key point in Heidegger's thought is that he problematized that from which the "presencing" of meaningfulness arises. In that regard, Heidegger's reading of Aristotle's thought as proto-phenomenology instead of naïve realism is important. Accordingly, what Aristotle was interested in was finding out the appearance of phenomena, as Sheehan puts it, "*within the field of human comportment and interpretation*."[265]

Sheehan's implicit topological interpretation of Heidegger has two sources: his reading of the event [*Ereignis*], which he prefers to call "appropriation", and its relation to the ancient Greek *aletheia*. First, let me bring to the fore Sheehan's exposition of the three implications of *aletheia* in Heidegger's thought. Sheehan finds three distinct yet correlated

[265] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 12.

senses of the notion of "*aletheia"*, which he refuses to call "truth of being", because according to him employing the notion in this way confounds our understanding of complex background of the notion. *Aletheia*-3 indicates correctness of a statement, the correspondence of intellect and thing. *Aletheia*-2 is the pre-propositional meaningfulness of things. *Aletheia*-1 signifies the *place* of the truth of being. In Sheehan's words, *Aletheia*-1, as the most fundamental significance of "truth of being", is the "open space" in which we can take things "as" something in their meaningful presence.[266] Sheehan claims that it is the *Aletheia*-1 as the occurrence of the open region of meaningfulness that makes possible the (2) pre-propositional availability of the unfolding of things as things to understanding, and (3) the apophantic correctness of things. Without the openness in which things can be gathered and disclosed, the correctness of our representations could not even become an issue. First and foremost, we need an access to that occurrence, as well as a site of dwelling in which this occurrence can take place and embody us in its happening.

The next crucial step is to find out what illuminates the question of being, which Sheehan takes as the question of humans' *openness* to "meaning-making", as the event or appropriation [*Ereignis*]. So far, we have seen three meaning of *aletheia*, which constitute the happening of the site of being, within which the unconcealment of the meaning of beings can take place. Now, in this three-fold structure, there is a unifying singularity that gathers together distinct yet correlated steps of the process of the unfolding of the sense of being. Sheehan claims, "it remained for Heidegger to see that *Ereignis*, the thrown-openness of ex-sistence, can never come into the open (a fact that Heidegger called *Ent-eignis*) precisely because it is the necessarily presupposed reason why there is an open at

[266] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 74-75.

all."[267] Here, Sheehan explains the topological relation between the event and the open in arguing that the event (appropriation) [*Ereignis*] is not a thing, but it is that on the grounds of which things come to be what they are. Accordingly, for Sheehan, the event is the "Ur-phenomenon" of Heidegger's entire thought. Why does Sheehan insist on using the term "thrown-open"? Sheehan understands the situatedness of human existence in the world as thrown-ness [*Geworfenheit*], in light of early Heidegger's philosophy. Accordingly, Dasein finds itself thrown (pro-jected) into its future possibilities of existence, always ahead of itself, in the world. The open signifies the "always-already opened up space"[268] that is the disclosedness of the meaning of things and its accessibility for the human intelligence. Without this openness, there can be no understanding of being, since the place, as the necessary condition of any understanding, would be missing. In turn, without the thrown nature of human beings' situatedness in the world (because in each and every case human being "finds" itself in the there), which also signifies the finite essence of human existence, there would be no relation to that site. What Sheehan calls the "thrown-open", then, indicates the site of being as the taking place of the unconcealment of what Heidegger explicates as the "truth of being" in the "Letter on Humanism". This could be interpreted as follows: the event [*Ereignis*] is the necessary condition of the following three-fold process: 1) the possibility of any meaning at all as situatedness in the openness (clearing) [*Lichtung*], 2) the happening of the unconcealment of the meaning of being, 3) the availability of meaningfulness to the human being. It follows that this three-fold occurrence takes place in the place and site [*Ort/Ortschaft*] of being. The event represents both the place and the taking place of the disclosure of the thingness of things. This is the main relationship between the three meanings of *aletheia* and the event. Therefore,

[267] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 78.
[268] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 20.

although he does not make an issue of the question of dwelling explicitly, Sheehan's position is through and through topological insofar as he argues that the central point in Heidegger's thought is *Ereignis* as the place [*Ort*] of *aletheia*, which delivers us to an understanding of things.

I have shown how Sheehan discusses the notion of the event as what constitutes the place-character of dwelling, if by dwelling we can understand the relationship between the situated human existence and its nearness to the manifestation of being itself. Sheehan explains the taking place of the event in six steps, without, however, bringing up the matter in terms of the question of language and dwelling.[269] The first and third points are significant:

> 1. To think or act dis-cursively entails "running back and forth" (*dis-currere*) between the thing and its meaning, or the tool and the task, as we check out whether this thing actually does have that meaning or whether in fact this tool is suitable for that task. […]
>
> 3. But we *can* think and act discursively only by metaphorically "traversing the open space" between the tool and the task, or the thing and its possible meaning.[270]

Two notions are important: a- *discurere* in the sense of "running back and forth *between*" and b- "traversing the open space", and its so-called "metaphorical" essence. Now, as I explained in the first chapter, the idea of "the between" is crucial in thinking the hermeneutic essence of our poetic relation to being with and as language. Without language, which as an idea that oddly lacks in Sheehan's discussions, there is not even an understanding of the fact that there can be any understanding. Things are meaningful because they appear as things *of* language. In that sense, things are always *linguistic* (they pertain to language). Earlier, I indicated that language as the place of "the between" and

[269] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 20.
[270] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 21.

the place of dependence brings out the dwelling place of the human being. This was the main topological point. Now, it should be pointed out that Sheehan associates thinking with "discursive action", which, in relation to the movement between the thing and its meaning, is a going back and forth, in the sense of inhabiting "the between". The reason why this is so is because the "sense" of the thing manifests itself via this back and forth movement, the "thrown-open" human existence being emplaced and interwoven in the con-text: (a) is the meaning of (b) as traversing the open space.

The issue here is that Sheehan calls thinking the "metaphorical" traversing between the thing and its being/meaning. What Sheehan means here by considering this discursive movement a "metaphor" is not clear. It is possible to see the movement of "running back and fro" not as a physical action that takes place in the brain or out there in space. He takes the dynamic relation between the thing and meaning to be an "abstract" movement. This would be the most plausible yet misleading reading of the use of the word "metaphorical", which is nevertheless misleading, in the sense of "abstract" or "theoretical". The word "metaphor" derives from the ancient Greek (*meta-pherein*) in the sense of "carrying something beyond, transferring".[271] However, if this is a transfer of an image of "place" or "space" onto the manifestation of being, then, the question lingers as to the "actual" essence of the relation between the thing and its meaning. Does that mean that this is how (in phenomenological terms) we could grasp the matter, yet, it *actually* occurs otherwise? Would not that imply that Heidegger's "hermeneutic phenomenological" position is just another appearance of metaphysics, which Sheehan refutes as a claim? I suggest that we should understand Heidegger's topological language in issuing the question of *aletheia* and the event beyond the literal-metaphorical dualism, because doing so conceals the essence of the issue.

[271] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 461.

My argument is as follows: the act of discursive traversing the open space of the interval between the thing and its appearance to human existence, insofar as it appears to us as such, signifies the dwelling and dwelling place of human beings. It simply points to the happening of the place of the event (and the event of place) *as* language. Now, this connects well with the fourth, fifth and sixth points in Sheehan's interpretation of Heidegger. The main issue in Heidegger's thought is not as Sheehan sometimes calls it, the "meaning" or the "sense of being", but as he himself comes to clearly express it at times, the place of being as the event [*Ereignis*], which situates us in the interplay, the inter-relation.

> 6. Therefore the always-operative thrown open clearing is the thing itself of all Heidegger's work.

Here Sheehan mentions the same point in saying that the "being itself" [*das Sein selbst*] amounts to the "thrown open clearing" or "appropriated clearing". [272] Accordingly, thinking is a deed that takes place in the clearing of being, which signifies the region in which human beings' relation to the world constitutes a meaningful context of "existence", an existence that can become meaningful only within the boundaries of language.

Now, let me clarify how this is related to the statement concerning the "house of being", which Sheehan does not address in his interpretation. Sheehan considers thinking as a discursive act that "runs back and forth" in the process of making sense of things. However, thinking cannot be grounded without language. Heidegger writes, "thinking attends to the clearing of being in that it puts its saying of being into language as the home

[272] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 21-22.

of eksistence."[273] What this means is that language is the place as the source of thinking, which, in turn, implicates that where there is no language, there can be no relation to the event [*Ereignis*]. Thinking stands in a relation to the manifestation of being only insofar as it can have access to the un-concealment [*aletheia*], which takes place in the occurrence of the "sense" of things in language. As we can primarily make sense of the meaning of things by regarding the difference from what they are not, language allows us to understand the meaning of things in their kinetic happening, namely, their movements. This would be an accurate description of thinking as a deed and discursive act. This is why Heidegger claims, "to bring to language ever and again this advent of being that remains, and in its remaining waits for human beings, is the sole matter of thinking"[274].

In Heidegger scholarship, Capobianco's reading of Heidegger on the question of *aletheia* diverges from Sheehan mainly in two points: 1) Capobianco retains the expression "truth of being" and uses it for the happening of the unconcealment of being as *aletheia*, and does not only associate it with the correctness of propositions, 2) For Capobianco, the unconcealment of being is not the emergence of the meaning of things, but it is the emergence of being itself. For Sheehan, *aletheia* and *physis* refer to the manifestation and availability of things in their appearance, while for Capobianco, *aletheia* and *physis*, along with *Lichtung*, *logos*, *hen, Ereignis* and such, are different names of the happening of being that all express the *same*. One way of understanding Capobianco's suggestion is that those notions and terms all signify the unified and singular essence of the event in different ways. If being has abundance of names as Aristotle suggests, then this is precisely where we observe it happening. This does not imply that different historical epochs understand the ground of being (being as beingness,

[273] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 274)
[274] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 275)

as the substance of all things) in different ways and thus name it differently, such as, *physis*, *poiesis*, God, *cogito ego*, technology. Capobianco presses the point that insofar as we understand the taking place of being (the appearance of being itself as the clearing), this is being itself [*Sein selbst*], which remains the "Ur-phenomenon" of Heidegger's thinking. When understood in this way, being itself already comprises the togetherness of being and human being, and there is no need to specify that the understanding of being is dependent on human existence. Otherwise, this makes the statement sound like a transcendental argument, which brings us back to an epistemology-based thinking of being, where the understanding of being remains a product of human "consciousness". This is where Capobianco refuses the move from *Sein* to *Sinn*.[275]

Now, I want to point out the possibility of a middle way between Sheehan and Capobianco. Insofar as both Sheehan and Capobianco admit that for Heidegger, the key question is the relation of the appropriation/event [*Ereignis*][276] and how it takes place via the manifestation of being (*aletheia*), their interpretations differ mainly in terminology and in their respective concerns regarding Heidegger's thought. In that regard, I would like to reiterate the substantial difference in their accounts, which I have discussed in the first chapter. Capobianco thinks that in Sheehan's reading, being turns out to be a production of human sense-making capacities. However, Sheehan also acknowledges the fact that even though it is human sense-making capacities that stand in the openness of the clearing of being, this disclosedness and availability to human intelligence is not something that human beings can make or produce. As I have discussed, it would be unfair to say that Sheehan only reads Heidegger only from a Kantian-Husserlian transcendentalist perspective, precisely due to his –restrained– topological concentration on the issue. He

[275] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 4.
[276] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being*, 19.

also acknowledges that Heidegger abandons the transcendentally oriented project after the turn.[277] Likewise, Capobianco does not state that the issue of understanding of being and the meaning of being are completely irrelevant topics at all. He only argues that meaning, at its deepest level, is related to the manifestation of being:

> The core matter for Heidegger – and for those inclined to his thinking – is that *physis* is the measure, not Dasein. Nevertheless, this by no means diminishes the human being, not at all. It is simply to recognize the limit of our marvellous *logos*, our comprehensibility (*Verstehbarkeit*), our taking-as, our meaning-making.[278]

What Capobianco argues here not mean that Dasein is not an integral element of the relation between the emergence of being and human being. His position does not assign agency to being either; on the contrary, he criticizes the view that takes being as "beingness" –as ground and cause of substance of things.

The question that needs to be addressed is whether it could be possible without the *place* of being, that is, language, for human being and being to ever appear in the same context of understanding and experience. In other words, how does *physis* appear for human being anyway? Likewise, how does human understanding respond to the presencing of things? What constitutes the nature of human existence in order to make it receptive and active (simply said, *responsive*) to the self-manifestation of the meaning of things? It is language, as the house of the truth of being that provides the human being with the capacity to partake in the correspondence with being. This is the meaning of "dwelling" in "the between". Human being does not simply express the meaning of being via language. On the contrary, according to Heidegger's position in the letter, language *is* what places the human being in the nearness of this understanding. Only then human

---

[277] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), xviii.
[278] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 63.

being can say and bring it to words. That said, language is not something that human makes or produce either. It is of the same essence as *physis* itself. It is in that context that thinking is a discursive action, in the sense of running back and forth, inhabiting "the between". This means that for Heidegger, the significance of human existence in responding to the unconcealment of being does not only indicate self-expression, but first and foremost attending, listening, and thus being receptive. This is why, according to Capobianco, human beings cannot exhaust the manifestation of being[279], because in each and every case it is human beings that partake in the happening of place as language. This does not mean that language is a mystical phenomenon independent of human existence, but it simply implies that language as the "relation of all relations" emplaces the human being in its dwelling place, namely, the site of the unconcealment of being. Language must be considered in this topological way where it exceeds the limitations of mere signs or instrument of communication[280].

II. 5 Heidegger, Sartre and Topology

Having examined the relation between the there [*Da*], human existence, *aletheia*, and language, I will now discuss Heidegger's critique of humanism, which will bring us back to the question of ethics. In this section, I will also engage with Joseph Fell's interpretation of Heidegger's topology, which has not received sufficient scholarly attention in Heidegger literature. His interpretation focuses explicitly on the link between being, place, and language. Looking into Joseph Fell's topological reading of Heidegger and Sartre can clarify the non-subjectivistic underpinnings of Heidegger's criticism of Sartre's existentialism.

[279] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being*, 47.
[280] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being*, 77.

Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism" can be read as a response to Sartre's 1945 public lecture *L'existentialisme est un humanisme* [Existentialism is a humanism], whose main purpose is to endorse existentialism as a legitimate philosophical movement. Existentialism has often been associated with pessimism and quietism, which are the charges that Sartre attempts to cast away in the lecture, as he tries to provide an ethical defence of his existentialism as a form of humanism.

For Heidegger, contemplating the relation in which human being stands to language means to investigate its *ethos*, which in itself is an "ethical" engagement, ethical taken in the sense related to the dwelling of human being. In that sense, "topology of language" itself is an "ethical" endeavour, insofar as it questions the being of human being via its relation to language. This is clear when Heidegger asks in the letter "can we obtain from such knowledge directives that can be readily applied to our active lives", and then goes on to argue that "such thinking comes to pass the distinction between 'practical' and 'theoretical'". It has no direct result and effect. On the contrary, "It satisfies in essence in that it is. But it is by saying its matter."[281]

Heidegger was dismissive of Sartre's way of linking the idea of "existence" and humanism because Sartre's conception of humanism was based on a metaphysical and subjectivistic understanding of being and human being. Fell summarizes in three points the points that Heidegger refutes in Sartre's reading: Sartre thought that, 1) Heidegger was an atheist existentialist, 2) advanced a thinking of human subjectivity, and 3) argued for the view that existence precedes essence.[282] According to Heidegger, his thinking is neither atheist nor existentialist in the way Sartre understands these terms. First, he objects to Sartre's association of his ideas with atheism and theism. This is because Heidegger

[281] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 272)
[282] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism is a Humanism*, trans. Carol Macomber (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007), 20.

makes no judgments concerning the existence or the non-existence of God in the way Christian tradition understands the concept.[283] His considerations regarding the existence of God are rather in line with Hölderlin and Nietzsche's idea that human beings' relation to God has been transformed in a way that the Christian God no longer appears as the gathering power for human beings. Heidegger's hermeneutics of the immortals problematizes the question of god(s) as immortals in poetic terms with respect to the question of finitude and dwelling of human beings.

Second, Heidegger explains in the letter that his thinking does not focus on human subjectivity[284], but on the contrary. In his later thought, Heidegger tries to avoid subjectivism by discussing "existence" as humanity's exposure to the clearing of being where its essence gets determined by that site of being. In other words, his conception of the human being is defined on the basis of the happening of the onto-ethical context in which human beings partake as the members of manifold interrelations that exceed the limits of subjectivity. Heidegger's later thinking problematizes the essence of human subjectivity, but does not depart from it. We can rather say that it attempts to arrive at a new understanding of human "subjectivity", which, however, need not be labelled as "subjectivity" because it does not think in terms of "subjects" and "objects". In specific, it considers the human being in its essence, that is, as *Existenz*, which comes to mean the "whither" of the self-manifestation of being where the unfolding of the meaning of being happens. In that sense, human existence is first and foremost the receiver of that which being gives in the there [*Es gibt*]. Sartre's interpretation of Heidegger is based on a human-centred reading of the Dasein analysis in *Being and Time.* However Heidegger explains that even Dasein cannot be merely thought as the "human being", but it should be thought as the "openness" of being, in Dasein's belonging to being [*Sein*].

[283] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 265-267)
[284] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 242-243, 260)

Finally, Heidegger does not think that existence precedes essence, but as he mentions in *Being and Time*, the essence of Dasein is grounded in its existence[285]. In other words, existence and essence should not be thought of in a dualistic way. The idea is rather that the humanness of human being is to be found in its existence. Based on these crucial differences, Heidegger's understanding of "humanism" differs fundamentally from that of Sartre's, because Heidegger has a completely different vision of the human being and of the relation between being and human being. Heidegger argues: "[S]artre expresses: we are precisely in a situation where there are only human being] […] Thought from *Being and Time*, this should say instead: we are precisely in a situation where principally there is being".[286]

This "situation" that is at issue here is exactly what refers to the topological sense of interrelatedness between being and human being which gathers them in the same site. Without this mutual correspondence between the "there" [*Da*] and being [*Sein*] *via* the event of the self-manifestation, there can be no "situation", for the ground and the place for it would be lacking. This is where Fell's interpretation of "topology" or "sense of place" comes to the fore. According to Fell, the entire modern European philosophy, following the thought of Galileo and Copernicus, represents the displacement of the human-centred, geocentric worldview.[287] What the phenomenological ontology inherited as a philosophical problem was to deal with the disorientation of the agent's ordinary phenomenal experience of the world. The phenomenological tradition, starting with Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty, attempted to inquire into our relation to phenomena in their appearing to human understanding, which necessitated to pose the

[285]Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1985), 152.
[286] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 254)
[287] Joseph Fell, *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place* (New York: Columbia Press, 1997), 3.

question of our being "placed" in the world. Heidegger's entire project, starting from *Being and Time* where he named the essence of being of human beings *Da-sein* [being-there], is an attempt to develop a thinking of the way in which human being exists, departing from its situated and contextualized character in place.

Now, according to Fell, the primary meaning of place in Heidegger's thought is the event [*Ereignis*][288], which signifies the "taking place" of the disclosedness of the intelligibility of beings, leaping from their originary, singular and simple ground, which is also the happening of the nature as *physis*. Unlike Sheehan, Fell explicitly acknowledges this as a topological project. All beings appear to understanding emerging from their hiddenness. This emergence is always a movement in and from place because of two reasons: 1) the event is literally the "appropriation" of the world and the earth to one another as the "worlded earth". Later Heidegger can advocate neither "idealism" nor "realism". On the contrary, with his focus on the situated character of the event, he wishes to overcome this dualism. 2) The event takes place *in* and *as* the clearing [*Lichtung*] of the site within which the world opens up to the earth and vice versa. The clearing, which designates the there of being (*Da* of *Sein),* is where the "world" and the "earth" correspond to each other as the event of place. In this context, Fell appropriately argues that this place is language: "The environment makes sense because it is always linguistic, for it is always already a juncture [*Fuge*] of the imperceptible and the perceptible, and in naming language accomplishes this juncture."[289] Furthermore, "to be human being is to be a linguistic being in a world of linguistic beings–that is to inhabit a world lighted by intelligibility".[290]

Here Fell uses the word "linguistic" in the simple sense of "pertaining to

[288] Joseph Fell, *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place*, 218.
[289] Joseph Fell, *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place* (New York: Columbia Press, 1997), 225.
[290] Joseph Fell, *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place*, 226.

language," where language comes to mean the dwelling-place of human being, in line with Heidegger's statement concerning the "house of being". It turns out that the "house of being" as the place of the event is precisely what amounts to language. We can ask, how is this related to the issue of the being of human being? In effect, as Fell suggests, human beings' "releasedness", to the clearing of being as language is the source of all human "activities", because this is what enables any understanding, as well as any meaningful act of responding to that which one understands. This is why the issue is not mere "understanding" or "meaning", but a correspondence; thus, the *topos* of understanding that also yields to communication must be language. When he writes, "what makes possible the entirety of human being-in-the-world is the event of the open place in language", he means the following: to be a human being is to exist in the clearing of being, which is meaningful and accessible to human beings *as* language. There is a difference between saying "in" language and "as" language, as in the former we might think that we are merely encompassed in language as if it is a space of meaning, whereas in the latter it becomes explicit that the event as the place and language already signifies the site where "saying" can become possible. With Fell's examinations of Heidegger's topology of language, it becomes clear that language for Heidegger means our exposedness and being given to understanding. This is why Heidegger calls the "releasedness to understand and respond" language, and this is also why understanding is always dependent on this directed and inter-dimensional situatedness of human existence. This is also the reason that language, as the house of being, is not "linguistic" in the sense of being constituted by the correspondence between phoneme and meaning. Human existence can be called "linguistic" insofar as it can be what it is by way of being related to and determined by its relation, distance, and nearness to language. In other words, the ground upon and from which any verbal and written discourse can unfold depends on the very presence of a site,

a clearing within which understanding and responding to that understanding is gathered together in the same inter-action. Only then, insofar as communicating appears within the radar of meaningful actions, language in the sense of discourse [*Rede*] can exist. This means that when we say that language is constitutive of human existence, the nearness to language is precisely the fundamental element, and not language as a means of communication. To say that language is not a mere means of communication does not mean we are advocating a "post-modern" Heidegger, but it simply points out the topological character of language from which any discourse emerges. Therefore, language, as the site of the event and the house of being is where understanding and communication appear always already linked.

Problematizing the meaning and place of language for human existence is the first necessary step to provide a definition of "humanism", because it first and foremost concerns the very fundamental *ethos* of human being. This approach is at odds with Sartre's view of existentialist humanism, which suggests that in order to accomplish a meaningful being in the world, one has to realize oneself through *praxis*. In advocating his existentialist humanism, Sartre states: "The doctrine that I am presenting to you is precisely the opposite of quietism, since it declares that reality exists only in action."[291] As I have discussed earlier in the chapter, this understanding of action depends on the presupposition that action means causing an immediate effect. Yet, this is precisely the approach that Heidegger challenges.

Heidegger's approach can be explained with the following example: before building a house, one has to focus on clearing up the field. First, we need to clear the ground before we set out to construct a building. The construction of a building does not commence by building the walls, putting bricks together, but by digging the ground for

[291] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism is a Humanism*, trans. Carol Macomber (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007), 36-37.

arranging the place for the instalment and erection of piles. Likewise, thinking is the act of clearing of the field by reconsidering of our relation to place, which is the true sense of restoring the meaning of humanness of humanity. Heidegger's answer to the question posed by Jean Beaufret regarding the meaning of humanism indicates an engagement with our place in the world via language. As such, in Fell's exploration of the issue, it appears that the disagreement between Heidegger and Sartre on the meaning of humanism could not be easily resolved as they follow completely different paths in their subsequent thoughts.[292] Sartre tries to think of being departing from the perspective of human subjectivity and consciousness, and Heidegger seeks to establish the reorientation of the relation between being and human being. Sartre declares the basis of his philosophy when he says "As our point of departure there can be no other than this: *I think therefore I am*".[293] Sartre thinks that in *Being and Time* Heidegger implicates a similar view, or he simply misreads Heidegger's Dasein as a substituting term for human subjectivity. Now let us review the consequences of these different visions of "human" and humanity, which brings us to different understandings of doing "philosophy".

II. 6 The Consequences of the "Letter on Humanism"

Although Heidegger's critique of philosophy plays a significant role in the letter, there is almost no engagement with this issue in Heidegger scholarship, focusing on his arguments in "Letter on Humanism". On the other hand, this is not surprising, as the commonplace academic attitude towards Heidegger's writings is to focus on his conceptual advances in hermeneutics, phenomenology or existentialism in order to produce new philosophical

[292] Joseph Fell, *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place*, (New York: Columbia Press, 1997), 364.
[293] Jean-Paul Sartre, *Existentialism is a Humanism,* p. 40.

theories or frameworks. This attitude overlooks the actual intellectual problems that stimulate Heidegger's concerns about the present state of thinking, as well as philosophy as an academic discipline in the Humanities. Any account of Heidegger's ethics (and topology of being and language) that does not pay attention to the relation between thinking and philosophy would be incomplete. At the end of the "Letter on Humanism", Heidegger announces the following provocative idea:

> It is time to break the habit of overestimating philosophy and of thereby asking too much of it. What is needed in the present world crisis is less philosophy, but more attentiveness in thinking; less literature, but more cultivation of the letter.
> The thinking that is to come is no longer philosophy, because it thinks more originally than metaphysics –a name identical to philosophy.[294]

The reason of the "crisis" in which we find ourselves is not only the oblivion of being, but also our oblivion of this oblivion –that the essence of being is *Ereignis*. The "crisis" is the "onto-ethical" homelessness of human beings that continues to propel. As we can see, there are two footholds of the issue: the first one is about place, for the oblivion of the event [*Ereignis*] amounts to an oblivion of the place of human being in the world, and the second one is about language, because, as the "relation of all relations", the abandonment of our dwelling in language results in the loss of a genuine relation to the world. This idea corresponds very well with one of Heidegger's earlier statements in the letter, that the thinking on language can no longer be a philosophy of language.[295] It appears that there is a parallel between Heidegger's increasingly topologically oriented thinking and his desire to "step-back" from the boundaries of academic philosophy.

In that vein of thinking, in this section I argue that 1) Heidegger's thinking of *ethos* as dwelling does not lead to an "ethical theory", but it leads to his topology of language,

[294] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 276)
[295] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 243)

2) Heidegger's topology of language, whose explicit foundations are laid in the "Letter on Humanism", must be read as a critique of our contemporary relation to philosophy as a mere academic discipline. The very problem is that there are experts in philosophy, however no more any thinkers. Before getting to this, let me briefly remind in four steps what we have reviewed so far in the "Letter on Humanism":

1) Heidegger's discussion of language concerns the relation between the "onto-ethical" nature of human existence (its directedness to the linguistic disclosure of things) and language (that which releases the human existence to the manifestation of being) as the dwelling place of human existence.

2) Language as the "house of being" is the place (the open-bounded) of the manifestation of being as *aletheia*-1 or the "truth of being". The "house of being" situates the essence of human existence in the clearing and as the openness of being that can respond to the manifestation of the meaning of things.

3) Inquiring into the dwelling of human being in "onto-ethical" terms also problematizes the *ethos* of human being in a fundamental way. This points to a topological mode of thinking that redefines the site of human existence with and in relation to language. In asking the question of language and dwelling in terms of the nature of human existence, we overcome the dualism between "ontology" and "ethics".

4) In such a mode of thinking, "thought" does not imply the "theoretical", just as "acting" does not imply the "practical". Therefore, producing new moral "theories" to be applied to so-called "practical" problems becomes pointless as the sole way of doing ethics.

Let me particularly focus on the fourth point, because specifying how Heidegger's thinking of *ethos* leads to his topology of language is essential, as Heidegger's critique of philosophy perfectly links up with this point. When Heidegger makes the connection

between *ethos* and ethics, he aims to problematize the actual dwelling place of the being of human *beings*. However, it is necessary to re-examine the legitimacy of academic divisions in philosophy such as “ontology”, “ethics” and “logic”. These divisions may be useful considering the pedagogic conveniences that they offer, in helping us identify and analyse thoughts and concepts via philosophical formulations. Therefore, Heidegger problematizes the very *ethos* of philosophy itself namely. He writes:

> Even such names as "logic," "ethics," and "physics” begin to flourish only when originary thinking comes to an end. During the time of their greatness the Greeks thought without such headings. They did not even call thinking “philosophy." Thinking comes to an end when it slips out of its element.[296]

It is well known Heidegger was thoroughly influenced by Aristotle and this is certainly the case regarding the question of ethics. Nevertheless, the reason why Heidegger goes to Heraclitus, and not to Aristotle in the “Letter on Humanism”, is thought provoking. At his time, Heraclitus did not know the word “philosophy”, and he did not consider the question of *ethos* under the rubric of “ethics”. However, this does did prevent Heraclitus from *thinking* and engaging with the question of the meaning of *ethos*. On the contrary, Heidegger claims that this is precisely why Heraclitus could think the question of “ethics” a more fundamental way than Plato and Aristotle. Wee need to identify the difference between thinking and philosophizing, as a mode of theorizing and conceptualizing: Heidegger writes:

> When thinking comes to an end by slipping out of its element it replaces this loss by procuring validity for itself as *techne* as an instrument of education and therefore as a classroom matter and later a cultural concern. By and by philosophy becomes a technique for explaining from highest causes. One no longer thinks; one occupies oneself with "philosophy." In competition with one another, such

[296] (“Letter on Humanism”, *Pathmarks*, 241)

> occupations publicly offer themselves as "-isms" and my to outdo one another.[297]

Here it becomes apparent that Heidegger is primarily interested in de-structuring [*Destruktion*], that is, loosening the boundaries of our conventional understanding of these "academic" divisions in philosophy. Their classification is "academic", because it belongs to an epistemic-scientific and objectifying mode of reflection with mostly pedagogic concerns, in the wake of Plato's Academy.[298] Pre-Socratic thinkers such as Anaximander, Heraclitus, and Parmenides asked concerning the meaning of *physis*, *ethos* and *logos* without having classified their thinking under the rubric of "ontology", "ethics", and "logic". Yet, they explored the nature and *arche* of existence, human being's place in the world, and the correspondence between the self-manifestation of nature (*physis*) and human beings in a holistic matter. In that context, the core issue of Heidegger's critique is regarding the envisioned gap between thought and action that is further reinforced in academic philosophy due to its calculative underpinnings. He thinks that when philosophy is taken up a mere research activity, even ethical theories turn into mere "professional" engagements. In the wake of scientific and technological organization of university, thinking turns into a mere battlefield of expertise, where different standpoints struggle to outclass and overcome one another.

Heidegger explicates the primary issue with our way of relating ourselves to the philosophical mode of thinking in the following passage, which I consider to be very significant:

> Since then "philosophy" has been in the constant predicament of having to justify in existence before the "sciences." It believes it can do that most effectively by elevating itself to the rank of a science. But such an effort is the abandonment of

[297] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 242)
[298] "Along with 'logic' and 'physics', 'ethics' appeared for the first time in the school of Plato. These disciplines arose at a time when thinking was becoming "philosophy," philosophy *episteme* (science), and science itself a matter for schools and academic pursuits". ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 269)

> the essence of thinking. Philosophy is hounded by the fear that it loses prestige and validity if it is not a science. Not to be a science is taken as a failing that is equivalent to being unscientific. Being," as the element of thinking, is abandoned by the technical interpretation of thinking. "Logic," beginning with the Sophists and Plato, sanctions this explanation. Thinking is judged by a standard that does not measure up to it. Such judgment may be compared to the procedure of trying to evaluate the essence and power of a fish by seeing how long it can live on dry land. For a long time now, all too long, thinking has been stranded on dry land.[299]

According to Heidegger, the technical understanding of logic underpins our ways of philosophizing. First of all, we must reinterpret the meaning of *logos*. [300] Logic, as the art and technique of reasoning, as well as reason as *ratio*, can make proper sense after we first look into the originary ground of logic as *logos*. We need to rethink the meaning of language as *logos* and its relation to being and human existence if we wish to get a grasp of our *ethos*.

In the summer semester of 1944, only a couple of years before he penned "Letter on Humanism", Heidegger gave a lecture course entitled *Logos* where he discussed Heraclitus' fragment B 50. The translation reads: "When you have listened not to me but to Logos, it is wise within the same Logos to say: One is All".[301] Initially, Heidegger provides further information about the etymological implications of *logos*, which allows for a topological interpretation.[302] In Greek, the verb *legein,* from which the word *logos*

---

[299] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 240)

[300] "This thinking alone reaches the primordial essence of *logos*, which was already obfuscated and lost in Plato and in Aristotle, the founder of 'logic'. To think against logic does not mean to break a lance for the illogical but simply to trace in thought the *logos* and its essence". ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 265)

[301] Martin Heidegger, *Early Greek Thinking*, trans. David Farrell and Frank A. Capuzzi (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1984), 59. (From here on: *Early Greek Thinking*)

[302] "Who would want to deny that in the language of the Greeks from early on *legein* means to talk, say, or tell? However, just as early and even more originally—and therefore already in the previously cited meaning—it means what our similarly sounding *legen* means: to lay down and lay before. In *legen* a "bringing together" prevails, the Latin *legere* understood as *lesen*, in the sense of collecting and bringing together. *Legein* properly means the laying-down and laying-before, which gathers itself and others. The middle voice, *legesthai*, means to lay oneself down in the gathering of rest; *lechos* is the resting place; is a place of ambush [or a place for lying in wait] where something is laid away and deposited." (*Early Greek Thinking*, 60)

derives, means to say, to speak.[303] Another meaning of the word is to lay and gather, in the sense of "letting-lie-before-us". As such, Heidegger observes a link between "saying" and "laying" when he argues, "Saying and talking occur essentially as the letting-lie together-before of everything which, laid in unconcealment, comes to presence."[304] Heidegger thinks that considering this very relation would show us an essential characteristic of the essence of language.[305] What language essentially accomplishes in its taking place is "luminous self-showing." [306] *Logos* and *aletheia* as the disclosure and self-showing/manifesting are the one and the same[307]. Heidegger concludes by stating: *The logos*, thought as the Laying that gathers, would be the essence of saying [*die Sage*] as thought by the Greeks. Language would be saying.[308]

This characteristic of language did not become explicit for ancient Greeks[309], because they were already living in that understanding of the word. In other words, they took it for granted, without having undergone an experience with it. With this idea in view, it is evident that we need a new sensitivity in thinking not only the linguistic qualities of language, but also our interaction and understanding of what we accomplish with language in our ordinary lives in reading, thinking, writing, and listening. A mere theoretical understanding of language will not be sufficient, and we must find ways to undergo a new experience with language, which, as an attempt, is the very practice of "ethics" (topology of language) itself.[310] As such, the question of language cannot be

[303] "What *logos* is we gather from *legein*. What does *legein* mean? Everyone familiar with the language knows that *legein* means talking and saying; *logos* means *legein* as a saying aloud, and *legomenon* as that which is said." (*Early Greek Thinking*, 60)
[304] (*Early Greek Thinking*, 64)
[305] (*Early Greek Thinking*, 63-64)
[306] (*Early Greek Thinking*, 64)
[307] (*Early Greek Thinking*, 70)
[308] (*Early Greek Thinking*, 77)
[309] (*Early Greek Thinking*, 77)
[310] This is precisely the point that Jussi Backman makes in his article when he writes: "Accordingly, Heidegger's lecture is not primarily a discourse on (*über*) the essence of language, but rather allows an indirect encounter with this essence by drawing our attention to the way

restricted to a certain philosophical model of questioning and theorizing, simply because language is not only an object of investigation. Our *relation* to language (dwelling) is what allows any investigation of language to emerge in the first place, as language is both the ground and horizon of any questioning.

Now, in light of these clarifications, what does Heidegger's topology of language entail? First of all, we should acknowledge that topology of language requires us to leave behind the representational mode of thinking deeply implemented in the act of "philosophizing". Philosophy is only a certain manifestation of thinking that flourished and started to lose its influence in the Occident in the wake of the emergence of particular sciences. The matter of thinking is no longer adequate to be thought under those rubrics due to the holistic nature of the issue, that is, the question of being. Heidegger argues:

> Because there is something simple to be thought in this thinking it seems quite difficult to the representational thought that has been transmitted as philosophy. But the difficulty is not a matter of indulging in a special sort of profundity and of building complicated concept rather, it is concealed in the step back that lets thinking enter into a questioning that experiences and lets the habitual opining of philosophy fall away.[311]

The representational thought, which Heidegger sees as the source of the inaptitude of philosophical discourses for rethinking the meaning of humanity and "humanism", cannot be "theoretically" or "practically" overcome by merely constructing various systems of thought. The representational thought is not adept at thinking without concepts, because it always has to have an image of what it attempts to think. The representational mode of reflection transforms its subject matters into "objects", for the being and unfolding of

---

discoursing takes place from and on the basis of (*von*) language. This is what Heidegger means by 'experience,' *Erfahrung,* in the emphatic sense: a journey (*Fahrt*) along the path of language as an event." Jussi Backman, "The Transitional Breakdown of the Word: Heidegger and Stefan George's Encounter with Language", in *Gatherings*, vol 1 (2011): 64.

[311] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 261)

being itself are not representable "objects".[312] Wittgenstein, who views the issue from a similar perspective, would support Heidegger concerning the necessity of stepping back from philosophy with a reconsideration of our relation to language, as he writes in the *Philosophical Investigations*: "philosophical problems arise when language goes on holiday."[313]Once we stop paying attention to the core matter of language, we are drawn into engaging with philosophical problems that are not even actual problems for "existence". Elsewhere, Wittgenstein also writes: "The real discovery is the one that enables me to break off philosophizing when I want to. The one that gives philosophy peace, so that it is no longer tormented by questions which bring itself in question"[314]. Heidegger's version of this idea is as follows:

> [L]anguage surrenders itself to our mere willing and trafficking as an instrument of domination over beings. Beings themselves appear as actualities in the interaction of cause and effect. We encounter beings as actualities in a calculative businesslike way, but also scientifically and by way of philosophy, with explanations and proofs.[315]

In this passage, Heidegger is not passing a judgment on the inherent value of logical explanations and proofs. He is essentially inviting us to reconsider the overall scheme in which academic philosophers are expected to "calculate". If the only objective of philosophical discourse is conceptual clarity and theoretical soundness, then it becomes questionable whether our attempt to move beyond the Cartesian framework is running in a vicious circle. This does not mean that conceptual clarity is bad for thinking, but it simply suggests that expecting a similar degree of conceptual-scientific precision for every

[312] Accordingly, if a topic at matter is not representable, then, it must belong to the domain of "metaphysics". This is precisely why Heidegger argues, as early as in 1929 in *What is Metaphysics* that Occidental thought is still not capable of thinking the "nothing".
[313] Ludwig Wittgenstein, *The Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G. E. M. Anscombe, P. M . S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), 23[e]. (From here on: *The Philosophical Investigations*)
[314] (*The Philosophical Investigations*, 57[e])
[315] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 243)

philosophical matter disrupts the nature of thinking itself. This is especially the case if the issue at hand is to refine our relationship to language. In other words, if the objective is to undergo a new experience with language, the technical use of language that might work well for other areas of philosophy may not be suitable for topology of language.[316] What poetic saying is capable of achieving has its own kind of rigor and soundness.[317] In light of these considerations, it becomes evident Heidegger's attitude toward philosophy (or metaphysics) can be characterized as a "stepping-back", which however should not be interpreted as a call to abandon philosophy. On the contrary, critically engaging with the tradition allows us to find our ways in thinking beyond it.

Heidegger states that the poetic mode of thinking that is to overcome metaphysics need to remain nameless without being conceptualized as a philosophical movement or method.[318] Instead of endlessly classifying philosophers and attributing pre-defined -isms to their ideas, we should let thoughts remain as thoughts. Heidegger writes, "Thinking is on the descent to the poverty of its provisional essence. Thinking gathers language into simple saying."[319] In this regard, topology of language must be understood as a confrontation with the ways and site of thinking which allows us to see that philosophy is only one of the possible ways of recounting the destiny of thinking.

In this chapter, I have discussed that Heidegger understands language as the dwelling place of human existence. In that regard, the idea of "relation" has been key in

[316] As Malpas argues: "The idea of topology suggests that it is a mistake to look for simple, reductive accounts—whether we are exploring a concept, or problem, or the meaning of a term, the point is always to look to a larger field of relations in which the matter at issue can be placed. This means, however, that it will seldom be possible to arrive at simple, univocal definitions." Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 35.

[317] The rigor of thinking: in contrast to that of the sciences, does not consist merely in an artificial, that is, technical-theoretical exactness of concepts. It lies in the fact that saying remains purely in the element of the truth of being and lets the simplicity of its manifold dimensions rule ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 241).

[318] "But if the human being is to find his way once again into the nearness of being he must first learn to exist in the nameless." ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 243)

[319] ("Letter on Humanism", *Pathmarks*, 276)

my argument. In the first chapter as the "between" and in the second chapter as the "house of being", I consider language as the dynamic happening between "being" ("ontological") and "dwelling" ("ethical") as that which interrelates being and human in dwelling. The "Letter on Humanism" indicates the commencement of the explicit topological orientation of Heidegger's thought of language, where the statement that "language is the house of being" appears for the first time. My approach has been "onto-ethical" in delineating the way in which human beings *dwell* in the openness of being [*Sein*], which appeared to be the "there" [*Da*]. The "there" is also the site of the event [*Ereignis*], which is intelligible to human beings as language. As the house of being, language gathers being and human being in the place of the event. Human being needs to learn to dwell in that "place" in order to fulfil its humanness, as this is how a non-metaphysical understanding of "humanism" can be developed. As such, the topology of language in the letter paved the way for a post-metaphysical engagement with the core matter of language as a "mindfulness of language". Now we can look into the happening of language itself as the "relation" and the "way" between being and human being. Examining his *magnum opus* on language, *On the Way to Language*, which I will undertake in the next chapter, should help us situate our thinking in the "ways" and "place" of thinking.

III. Language and Dwelling in the 1950s and 1960s

Thus far I have shown that we must read Heidegger's "topology of language" as non-metaphysical approach that seeks to move beyond the existing paradigm of philosophies of language. Heidegger's idea in the late 1940s is that we must first find a proper "relation" to language in which we can discourse "about" it, which must unfold from our dwelling in the "house of being". What has not become obvious so far is the "way" in which we can undergo an experience with language, which is an issue that appears in Heidegger's thought in the 1950s and onwards. To that end, in this chapter I will examine Heidegger's *On the Way to Language* (1959) and I will conclude the chapter with a discussion of the *Conversation on the Country Path* (1966). While the former can be seen as Heidegger's *magnum opus* on the question of language, the latter work is also extremely significant in exemplifying the relationship between "letting-be" or "releasement" [*Gelassenheit*], thinking and language. Appropriately understanding the nature of language and its relation to the issue of dwelling (as our onto-ethical experience of being placed) requires me to explain and discuss the topological foundations of the link between "way", "way-making" and the event, which is the key point in Heidegger's thought of language in the 1950s.

In that context, the structure of the chapter will be as follows: 1) I problematize the way and the 'method' in which we can discuss and situate [*er-örtern*] ourselves in the "event *of* language". As such, the primary focus will be on the notion of "situating-discussing" [*Erörterung*] and its relation to place [*Ort*]. 2) I explain the difference between "method" and "methodology", and discuss the trifold relationship between "hermeneutics", "phenomenology" and "hermeneutic phenomenology". I evaluate the significance and the role of Heidegger's topology of language with regards to the issue of

the ground and horizon of the question of language. 3) Departing from the "method" of the "discussion", I bring to the fore the topological significance of the "way" of language and its "way-making" movement, explicating the relation between "way", "way-making", "movement" and place in relation to the event of language. In that regard, I highlight the trifold relation between "silence", "speaking", and "saying" which appear as distinct moments of the happening of language. 4) I discuss the meaning of the Japanese word *Koto ba* as a poetic designation of the essence of language as "saying" that shows forth the "way-making" movement. I show the way in which "discussion" discloses the event of language and its relation to the emergence of nature. In doing so, I also discuss the influence of Asian thought in Heidegger's later thought. 5) I bring to the fore and elaborate on the idea of sameness of the "event of language" and the "language of the event". In that context, I explain why and how Heidegger criticizes Humboldt's subjectivistic philosophy of language. Subsequently, I discuss Ziarek's account of Heidegger's discussion of language as the site of the event, and explain the relation between "topology of language" and "topographics of language" in pointing out the significance of moving away from the "meaning of being" to "truth of being" and "place", and the spacing between them. 6) I explicate the link between Heidegger's understanding of the "framework" as the essence of modern technology and how the "framework" signifies the logical-logistic manipulation of the "way-making" of *logos*. 7) By showing how the critique of the "framework" brings us to the late notion of "letting-be" or "releasedness", I discuss the topological underpinnings of notion of the "region" as the place of dwelling and "in-dwelling" which appears as the mode and way of dwelling as "non-willing".

III. 1 *Erörterung*: The *Way* of Discussing-Situating Language

In this section, I introduce the notion of *Erörterung*, which means "situating-discussing"[320] and appears as the "method" (way) of the discourse on language. I will clarify how we should understand "situating-discussing" as an original "method", as well as how to better make sense of the very term "method".

We encounter the notion of *Erörterung* mainly in two essays in *On the Way to Language*: first, in "A Dialogue on Language" (1953/54), second, in "Language in the Poem: A Discussion [*Erörterung*] on Georg Trakl's Poetic Word" (1953). It is in the latter piece that Heidegger highlights the etymological implications of the word and points out the relation between "discussing" and place:

> We use the word "discuss" here to mean, hint, to point out the proper place or site of something, to situate it, and second, to heed that *place* or *site*. The placing and the heeding are both preliminaries of discussion.[321]

Heidegger's thought emphasizes the point that in German, discussing [*erörtern*] a subject matter means situating it in its belonging context or place.[322] "Situating" [*er-örtern*] derives from "place" [*Ort*]. Accordingly, the aim of a discussion [*Er-örterung*] is to situate its subject matter in context, so that it can gather the issue at hand in such a way that the "topic" can become a matter of conversation and discussion.[323] This means that

---

[320] I will use both "situating" and "discussion" when referring to the word *Erörterung* in quotation marks, and I will refrain from translating it as "situating-discussing" as much as possible, because in colloquial German, it simply means "discussion" and its topological background is rather implicit. The translation "situating-discussing" is useful only in places where mere "situating" or "discussion" does not sufficiently clarify the topological meaning of the context.

[321] (*On the Way to Language*, 159)

[322] In Turkish, the reciprocal verb "speaking" *konuşmak* and the noun "neighbour" *komşu* derive from the common root verb *kon-* "to situate one self". (See: Introduction, 1)

[323] Malpas also dwells on the topological underpinnings of the word *Erörterung* as discussion or inquiry: "The employment of '*Ort*' as a term that relates to *topos* is itself indicated by the way in which both terms figure in ways that can be used to designate a discussion or focus of inquiry.

we must first let the "topic" become apparent in and from its proper place [*topos*]. Heidegger's use of the notion is inherently related to the fact that he attempts to reorient our way of thinking the nature of language so that we learn to think with and *of* language. According to Heidegger, in the course of a conversation[324], the aim should not simply be to construct a "view" (theory), but rather to first allow for the open space from which any "viewing" can become possible. In other words, first, one must access the horizon that from and within which things can be seen and grasped. "Discussion" aims to provide the "access" in opening the way from the ground to the horizon. The dialogue "on" language is grounded "in" and "of" language itself by which one attempts to comport oneself to the inner movements of language instead of "setting" [*thesis, tithenai*] it theoretically from a distance.

Such a way of "situating" ourselves in language, which is the way in which we relate ourselves to the "event of language", can be called Heidegger's "method" of discussion *of* the nature of language. The very first application of this "method" can be found in the first essay of the English translation of *On the Way to Language*, where Heidegger converses with the Japanese professor Tezuka about language. The original title of the essay is more suggestive than the English translation ("Dialogue on Language"), as it literally says "*Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache*": "From a dialogue

---

This is true of the English word 'topic' and so the idea of 'topology' in Heidegger's thinking can sometimes be viewed as relating as much to the idea of a literary or textual 'site' as to a place as such. The German term '*Erörterung*,' which contains '*Ort*' within it, also means a debate or discussion, but Heidegger employs it in a way that plays on the sense of 'situating,' 'locating,' or 'placing' that it also connotes. This is significant, not because it somehow shows that Heidegger's talk of '*topos*' or '*Ort'* is really a reference to something linguistic, but rather because of the way it is indicative of the intimate connection between language and place." Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 30.

[324]The English word "conversation" also has the meaning of abiding, living with, turn round, and remain. Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 164.

(conversation-discussion) *of* the language".[325] The first essay of the original volume *Unterwegs Zur Sprache* "*Die Sprache*" (1950), which is not included in the English translation, problematizes our "situation" *vis-à-vis* language and the event at the very outset. "Die Sprache erörtern heißt, nicht so sehr sie, sondern uns an den Ort ihres Wesens bringen: Versammlung in das Ereignis."[326] This essay ("The Language") could be found in *Poetry, Language, Thought*, which is an edition that consists of Heidegger's various essays. Albert Hofstadter translates the sentence as follows: "To discuss language, to place it, means to bring to its place of being not so much language as ourselves: our own gathering into the appropriation."[327] An alternative translation could emphasize the key issue more explicitly: "Discussing language does not so much mean situating it (language), but rather bringing ourselves into the place of its essence: gathering in the event." With this translation it appears clearly that it is language that situates us in place, not human subjectivity that situates language. The task is to let language situate us through our discussing it, which is the true meaning of "situating-discussion". Therefore, before we come to produce a "thesis" about language, we should first attempt to find the way in which language "attunes" our very being so that a genuine correspondence can take place.

As I will explicate below in detail, in the course of their conversation, neither Heidegger nor Tezuka force one another to come up with, or depart from a pre-defined theory of language:

> I: Speaking *about* language turns language almost inevitably into an object.
> J: And then its reality vanishes.[328]

[325] Martin Heidegger, GA: 12 *Unterwegs Zur Sprache*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985.
[326] Martin Heidegger, GA: 12 *Unterwegs Zur Sprache* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985), 10.
[327] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 188)
[328] (*On the Way to Language*, 50)

The phrase "its reality vanishes" can be properly understood as follows: When we objectify language by only speaking *about* it, its "taking place" (i.e., its reality) is concealed (vanishes). As such, the discourse on language is a dialogue, and therefore it is a mutual act of situating, which does not draw upon a pre-fixed "standpoint". This is related to the kinetic nature of place, which requires us to consider the role of "way" and "the between", as we orient ourselves with regards to and in places by moving in and between them. The notion of place that is at stake here can be understood in relation to the nature of language as an active happening, which gathers us around a subject matter, a *topic*, insofar as we let it take over our objectifying comportment. The hermeneutic circularity at issue is that whenever we talk about language, we already find ourselves moving within the boundaries of language. Yet, it is precisely this circularity –understood in the sense of a dynamic and circular movement that results in creating its own *topos*– that allows us to approach the question of language again and again, and consider language not as something that we can exhaust as a mere object of investigation, but rather as the very place of the *discussion* which *situates* us. The "discussion" of language has neither a predefined "viewpoint", nor it aims to arrive at a conclusive, univocal "concept" of language: it simply journeys the "saying" of language in listening to [*zuhören*] and belonging [*gehören*] to it. Let me clarify the "situating" nature of discussion.

I have claimed that "situating" is the "method" of the discussion. At this point, it is useful to distinguish "method"[329] from "methodology". Heidegger marks this difference by looking into the meaning of the notion of "way", which is what the word "method"

[329] Method, *methodos* in ancient Greek, derives from the combination of two words namely *meta+hodos*. *Meta* stands for "after", as *hodos* means "way". Literally, it means "a way to be followed after".

means in ancient Greek.[330]. Now, for Heidegger, "methodology" indicates the logical formalization of the way in which language moves in the course of a dis-course.[331] Every questioning has a "method", in the sense that every questioning "follows after" [*nachgehen*] a certain "way" in order to be able to "dwell" on the *topic* of that which it makes an issue.[332] If the essential meaning of "method" is searching and following after the matter itself, then, the topological "method" that is at issue here is the "discussion" of language in the sense of situating ourselves in accordance with the "way(s)" and movements of language.[333]

Heidegger puts forward the idea that modern science and technology no longer understands "method" as the "way" of thinking, but only as "methodology", as the logical arrangement and organization of the "techniques" in and through which one reflects by calculating and accounting. As such, one arrives at accounts and theories about this or that idea. Yet, it is evident that Heidegger does not appeal to some sort of "method–less", wishful thinking. The point is that the "method" (way) should be determined in accordance with the proper context of the *topic* (the place of the subject matter) and therefore, a methodology that does not belong to the context of the matter should not be externally applied to it. The subject matter and our way of discussing it must disclose its proper "methodology". Not doing so renders the "method" a "methodology", a predefined

[330] Brogan claims that Aristotle does not use the term merely as a "technique", as it is the case in its modern scientific or artistic use "Method is not a technique for Aristotle. It is, as his manner of inquiry, a remaining faithful to the matter that presents itself, by questioning the matter in regard to its being Walter A. Brogan, *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2005), 80.

[331] (*On the Way to Language*, 74)

[332] "Questioning builds a way. We would be advised, therefore, above all to pay heed to the way, and not to fix our attention on isolated sentences and topics. The way is a way of thinking". (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 3)

[333] Otto Pöggeler also aptly makes this claim as he suggests: "Heidegger compares his ground–word *Ereignis* with words such as *tao* and *logos*, and he often remarks that in our word 'method' the Greek word for 'way' still resonates, but that the insistence on and absolutization of method distort every following of a way and thereby the collecting of oneself for the event of appropriation." Otto Pöggeler, "West–East Dialogue: Heidegger and Lao–Tzu", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 62.

"technique" and a "procedure" by way of which one pre-determines the "scope" of the topic, before having followed the way of the– matter itself. When applied as such, methodology denotes the objectified systematization-formalization of the way(s) and their movement. Heidegger claims:

> The sciences know the way to knowledge by the term "method." Method, especially in today's modem scientific thought, is not a mere instrument serving the sciences; rather, it has pressed the sciences into its own service.[334]

Here, Heidegger wishes to draw attention to the fact that there are at least two ways of understanding how methods function. On the one hand, the method can serve as the instrument to knowledge, and on the other hand, the method can be applied in a way that it turns into a tool that instrumentalizes knowledge. Nevertheless, what Heidegger aims to point out in relation to the question of language is not simply the understanding of method as an instrument that we can apply in order to obtain more knowledge about language. If the primary purpose is to revise our relation to the proper nature of language, then, there can be no pre-scribed, pre-defined "methods" as instruments that bring us to knowledge. The aim is not to use the "method A" in order to get to the point Y from X. Therefore, it is clear that we need a third way of understanding methods, one that does not determine the method as a mere instrument to get more knowledge "about" language. This is the significance of "situating-discussing" where the "method" is not applied in a logical-logistic way, but the matter of the topic itself is "followed-after", which first clears the "way". It is in that context that Heidegger endorses a topological understanding of the "method" as way and refrains from making sense of it as "methodology". In *On the Way to Language* he writes:

[334] (*On the Way to Language*, 74)

> In thinking there is no method or theme, but rather the region, so called because it gives its realm and free reign to what thinking is given to think. Thinking abides in that country, walking the ways of that country. Here the way is part of the country and belongs to it.[335]

The topologically oriented wording at this passage is not arbitrary, and it should awaken us to thinking the place-nature of the issue at hand. We can unpack the statement as follows: thinking means dwelling, as walking the ways of the country in which it is rooted, that is, language. As I have discussed in the previous chapter, for Heidegger, there is a major difference between "thinking" and "philosophizing", and they do not only signify different names for the same action. The latter can be designated as the kind of reflection that walks the paths of thinking that have been already opened. In order to argue for this or that, one needs to get from here to somewhere else by following such and such route. However, as I will discuss, meditative thinking, whose nature is poetical, differs from a philosophical mode of thinking (propositional and representational) that is grounded in *episteme* from which modern sciences have emerged. The poetic (or meditative) thinking first finds and opens the paths to be walked, "walking" in the sense of moving within the boundaries of language on the way to (and from) the clearing. In "thinking" meditatively we can also disclose that which has been concealed in "philosophizing" about "philosophy". As such, thinking first and foremost brings us to where we have always and already been. It does not produce a different "technique" of thinking, but summons us to approach "philosophy" anew, without "philosophizing". Therefore its "following-after" is not the same as following a technique (or a mode of argumentation) that has been already established. The task at hand (undergoing an experience with language) requires thinking: it means first finding one's way in the language and orienting oneself in and among different paths of thought. This is why we

[335] (*On the Way to Language*, 74)

need to constantly orient ourselves in language, which first requires finding the "way(s)" and "movement" *of* language so that we can arrive at its openness. Insofar as we only theorize about language, we get away from its actual core matter. Heidegger's "way" of inquiring into the question of language indicates the necessity of orienting oneself in the site of the question within which a genuine conversation and discourse can take place.

The aim of the "discussion" *of* language, which is distinct from mere theorizing *about* language, is also what Heidegger calls "letting language speak". It means letting the language to become a matter of topic on its own terms, and not on the basis of pre-defined theories. We should let language transform our relation to things instead of imposing theories designating the "what-ness" of language. As such, it signifies indeed an attempt to go beyond a mere discourse *about* language that departs from human subjectivity, especially in thinking about the question of being as the event, which is accessible via and as the question of language and dwelling.[336] The main objective is to let language come to its own by situating us in its happening because being is what is "proper" to human beings. This is related to the idea that for Heidegger, it is not that human being "has" the language, but language "has" the human being, because it is language that determines the essence of the human existence as the openness of being, as the "there". I will explain this idea in detail later in the chapter.

In this context, Heidegger's dialogue with professor Tezuka aims to perform a thinking dialogue on essence of the nature of language.[337] Reinhard May reminds us that

[336] This attitude towards language within the limits of conversation could be named therapeutic. Wittgenstein had a very similar vision of philosophical discussions "125. Philosophy just puts everything before us, and neither explains nor deduces anything. Since everything lies open to view, there is nothing to explain." (*The Philosophical Investigations*, 55[e]). "If someone were to advance theses in philosophy, it would never be possible to debate them, because everyone would agree to them." (*The Philosophical Investigations*, 56[e])"

[337] We must note that the text is still written by Heidegger himself, and the dialogue is loosely based on one of his conversations with Tezuka in 1953/54. In a sense, the dialogue should be considered similar to Socratic dialogues. That is, the exact authenticity of dialogue is disputable,

the dialogue is a pseudo-dialogue, because it is not entirely based on the actual conversation that took place between Heidegger and Tezuka, and it contains Heidegger's self-interpretations of Tezuka's words.[338] However, what should rather concern us is the context of the text itself, and not so much the biographical accuracy of the "actual" dialogue, because first and foremost the dialogue attempts to indicate a way in which we should undergo an experience with language rather than giving an account of language. Heidegger and Tezuka, which are respectively named as "Inquirer" and "Japanese" in the original text and not as Heidegger and Tezuka, try to establish a genuine context (a ground and a horizon) of discussion within the boundaries of which they may come to "say" something of the nature of language (in the sense of letting language "show" something of itself). The possibility that this may not even occur so is a point upon which they agree, and in effect, this is precisely the comportment towards language that releases their "con-versation" into the openness of thinking. This changes the focus from a "philosophy of language" where we try to explain what language amounts to by series of propositional arguments to an open-ended dialogue with language itself. It acknowledges silence as the essential characteristic of the speaking *of* language that may hint something about the nature of language. Now, having clarified what it means to be situated by language let me explain the "horizon" and the "ground" of the "way".

III. 2 The Ground and the Horizon of the Way

In the course of the conversation between Heidegger and Tezuka, the "discussion" *of* the Japanese notion *Iki* serves as a significant gateway to situate the question concerning the

---

and yet, what matters for us is the ideas discussed in the text, as we will address the problem of authenticity in the next section with regards to the problem of hermeneutics and *Erörterung*.

[338] Reinhard May, *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work*, trans. Graham Parkes (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 47

nature of language. The difficulty of talking about the meaning of *Iki* results from the lack of a common horizon of understanding. This is why Heidegger and Tezuka acknowledge the necessity to address the nature of a dialogue before they venture to explicate the meaning of the notion. This is where the ground and the horizon of their discussion immediately becomes the focus. In this way, they come to discern that the "situating-discussion" is to primarily provide a *way* for them to arrive at the shared horizon of the *topic*. In other words, discussion should situate us in the *topos* of the topic. In that sense, discussion should not be merely understood as a mere exchange of viewpoints and opinions, or as a conceptual analysis written in the form of a dialogue. This is why the meaning of *Iki*, which is related to the discussion of the Japanese word for the event of language *Koto ba*, remains enigmatic until the late stages of the dialogue.

Concerning his earlier conversations with Count Kuki, who is a former colleague and student of his, Heidegger claims: "The danger of our dialogues was hidden in language itself, not in *what* we discussed, nor in the *way* in *which* we tried to do so."[339] The danger is that "the languages of the dialogue shifted everything into European."[340] Accordingly, the danger that worries Heidegger is the following one: if *Iki* is a Japanese expression, and, if the language of the dialogue is German, then, how is it possible to understand *Iki* within the boundaries of German language while not transforming the original context and background of *Iki* into something foreign to its own nature? In other words, is there a way to discuss the subject matter without appealing to subjectivism and objectivism? What must be the ground and the horizon of the discussion that gathers its interlocutors in the same "between"?

Here, let me briefly bring into view Gadamer's conception "the fusion of horizons" [*Horizontverschmelzung*] becaue it is in many ways comparable to Heidegger's

[339] (*On the Way to Language,* 4) (My emphasis)
[340] (*On the Way to Language*, 4)

discussion, and it can help us to understand the nature of the dialogue between Heidegger and Tezuka. The "fusion of horizons" is one of the key notions in Gadamer's *Truth and Method*[341], which denotes the intertwining of distinct horizons of understanding that takes place[342] in the act of interpreting works of art, philosophical texts, but also the respective standpoints and opinions of the participators of a dialogue. Indeed, dialogue does not only imply two persons' simultaneous speech, but it indicates the mutual interaction of two sources of discourse that co-determine one another. In that sense, it could be understood as a readiness to encounter the "other", as much as a willingness to encounter one's own anew thanks to and through the "other". Gadamer initially relates the notion of horizon with the idea of limit:

> Every finite present has its limitations. We define the concept of "situation" by saying that it represents a standpoint that limits the possibility of vision. Hence essential to the concept of situation is the concept of "horizon".[343]

Within that context, Gadamer emphasizes the very temporal-historical significance of the concept of horizon. The "situation" in which we find ourselves is through and through historical. The historical horizon of understanding in which we are taken up determines the way in which we experience our life-worlds, the very factual state of affairs in everyday life. However, inasmuch as the temporal-historical situation determines and de-limits our understanding, it can be also liberating in providing the boundaries for it, which are the "limits" of that life-world. Only in encountering the "limits" which bounds the neighbouring space, the site can become apparent as a whole. This is why Gadamer writes, "On the other hand, 'to have a horizon,' means not being limited to what is nearby but

[341] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London & New York: Continuum, 2004. (From here on: *Truth and Method*)
[342] (*Truth and Method*, 305)
[343] (*Truth and Method*, 301)

being able to see beyond it".[344] According to Gadamer, in order to have a "horizon" of understanding, one must maintain a sense of openness that allows one to move beyond the limits of his or her own understanding of the world. As such, if my understanding were to have a horizon, this means that it ought to provide more than a mere acceptance of or submission to the societal and cultural norms and values that construct my life-world. It must disclose the life-world of one's and the other, while also gathering them in the same nearness.

As we can see here, any "horizon" is already a fusion of previously fused horizons. The "fusion of horizons" means that two or more horizons of understanding co-determine and constructively transform one another. This is why there is never a self-contained and isolate horizon. While Gadamer talks about "horizons" more specifically in the context of one's historical confrontation with one's tradition, we can also observe more specifically the spatial and topological significance of the fusion of horizons in the course of the dialogue between the two interlocutors. This is where we can make a comparison between Heidegger and Gadamer, as well as consider the nature of the dialogue between Heidegger and Tezuka.

An ideal dialogue necessitates several basic characteristics that interlocutors must perform: 1) an active cooperation in attending the subject matter, 2) refraining from pre-defining the course of the dialogue and avoiding pre-determined conclusions, (3) a readiness and an openness to the possibility that one may have to change one's previous standpoint. The very nature of the conversation between Heidegger and Tezuka shows forth such a mindfulness in the attempt of opening up a way of bringing the relation between language and being into perspective. Now, while it is possible to conceive of Gadamer's "fusion of horizons" similar to the Hegelian sense of the dialectical occurrence

[344] (*Truth and Method*, 301)

of sublation [*Aufhebung*], both Gadamer and Heidegger's concerns differ significantly from Hegel's way of thinking. First, Heidegger endorses the holistic singularity of the way in which distinct horizons of understanding appear in the event of language as the happening of the open site of being. This singularity, however, is not a pre-arranged agreement in which both interlocutors happen to share the same worldview. It is rather a correspondence [Ent-*sprechung*] that opens up the dialogue [*Ge-spräch*] through the speaking [*sprechen*] of the speakers, which requires a two-way movement, where the shared site of being comes to emerge. The "fusion" that is at stake here is not the dialectical struggle of two "presences" that come to be overcome by a higher and more complete "view". This is because the "fusion of horizons" does not have a *telos*, a logically explicable and pre-defined end, which distinguishes the notion from Hegel's dialectics. On the very contrary, the "fusion" that is at stake brings each "boundary" to the openness of the other, and this is the meaning of a horizon, where the limit both discloses and gathers two distinct boundaries in the same "between". The matter at stake is not the accumulation of *episteme* in order to attain a more absolute "truth", but being emplaced in the very happening of a horizon of understanding in which the unconcealment of any "truth" becomes possible in the first place.

In the beginning of the section, I argued that the discussion concerning the meaning of *Iki* was the main departure point of the conversation between the interlocutors. It was initially held back due to the necessity of first coming to terms with the horizon and ground (context) of the dialogue in situating oneself in the *site* of the conversation. At this point, the question concerning the phenomenological and hermeneutic underpinnings of the nature of their dialogue comes to the fore. Tezuka insistently invites Heidegger to clarify his position with regards to both phenomenology and hermeneutics in a number of

different instances in the course of the dialogue.[345] Both Tezuka and Heidegger identify that thinking under the rubric of such terms such as "hermeneutics", "phenomenology" or "hermeneutic phenomenology" do not assist us in undergoing a new relation with the language, unless we first come to appropriate our relation to these philosophical movements and methods. Tezuka and Heidegger discuss the relationship between hermeneutics and phenomenology as follows:

> I: As I do so, I would like to start from the etymology of the word; it will show you that my use of the word is not arbitrary, and that it also is apt to clarify the intention of my experiment with phenomenology.
>
> J: I am all the more puzzled that you have meanwhile dropped both words.
>
> I: That was done, not-as is often thought-in order to deny the significance of phenomenology, but in order to abandon my own path of thinking to namelessness.
>
> J: An effort with which you will hardly be successful.
>
> I: … since one cannot get by in public without rubrics.[346]

The passage above can be interpreted as follows: Heidegger acknowledges that when seen from a purely philosophical point of view, his later thinking can be said to have "phenomenological" underpinnings, but to call it under that rubric does not help us in undergoing an experience with language, which for him appears as the actual task of thinking. The thought and its method should initially rather remain nameless. The "namelessness" that is at issue here denotes the kind of thinking that refrains from pre-determining the "course" of its "discourse". This attitude is similar to what Heidegger called the "de-structuring" in *Being and Time*, in terms of the history of ontology.[347] De-

[71] (*On the Way to Language*, 9-10)
[346] (*On the Way to Language*, 29)
[347] (*Being and Time,* 44)

structuring does not imply destruction; on the contrary, it indicates the act of loosening the boundaries [*Abbau*] so that the site of the *topic* itself can come into full view. The passage above can also be read in connection with Heidegger's position in the "Letter on Humanism" where he explicates that a philosophical mode of reflection is no longer apt in thinking through the core issue of language, because it immediately transforms language into an organisable, orderable, calculable object. Therefore, the debate on the question of phenomenology, hermeneutics, and hermeneutic phenomenology should primarily guide us in understanding the way in which Heidegger oriented his later thinking. In that regard, Tezuka asks Heidegger about his encounter with Count Kuki, when Heidegger had mentioned to him a "new direction" in phenomenology under the rubric of "hermeneutic phenomenology". Heidegger responds to this inquiry by saying:

> I: It may indeed have looked that way. In fact, however, I was concerned neither with a direction in phenomenology nor, indeed, with anything new. Quite the reverse, I was trying to think the nature of phenomenology in a more originary manner, so as to fit it in this way back into the place that is properly its own within Western philosophy.[348]

Heidegger here emphasizes that he was primarily interested in showing the very *source* of "phenomenology" as to what makes our understanding of the meaningful "presencing" of things possible in the first place, which is a project that he advances via the question of being. The way in which Heidegger understands "phenomenology" as a philosophical movement is entirely different from how, for instance, his teacher Husserl conceived it. Heidegger sought to change the focus of phenomenological discourse from consciousness to being, although thinking the former was essential to Husserl's project.[349] As for

[348] (*On the Way to Language*, 9)
[349] "Heidegger's hermeneutical transformation of Edmund Husserl's phenomenology frees its from its one-sided orientation toward perception and theoretical knowledge, and leads to an ontological reinterpretation of the phenomenon. The phenomenon belongs no longer to consciousness. For

Heidegger, it becomes clear in his later thought that any discourse of consciousness is derivative of the gathered-situated nature of human existence, not in particular ontic "life-worlds", but first and foremost in the very state of being situated in the "there" as the openness and clearing of being where any "life-world" can come to be situated and make sense for us in the first place. In other words, Heidegger's thought seeks after the gathering place of being and human being in their mutual correspondence, especially the opening that allows human beings to respond to the disclosure of being, which is, as being-in-the-world (or the later fourfold), what allows human beings to have "consciousness" in the first place. That said, as consciousness is always the consciousness of something that *is*, the more essential question is the ways in which we encounter the source and very emergence of being itself. Therefore, the source of phenomenology for Heidegger must be the study of the way in which we are situated in the happening of the event, which becomes accessible to human beings via language. As such, phenomenology can no longer be the sole "method" of thinking. Phenomenology, which looks to the meaningful appearance of phenomena, must first look to the "grounding" of the ground from which any appearing becomes possible. This means it should consider the dynamic relation between the "ground" and whatever sources from that ground. Thinking, then, must look into the mutual correspondence between the emergence of the ground and the horizon in the site of being.

In the previous chapters I have argued that my position is "onto-ethical", which I considered to be one of the main characteristics of "hermeneutic topology", especially in looking to the relationship between the place of being and the dwelling place of human beings. So far, the meaning of hermeneutics has come to the focus only in terms of its relation to poetry. Now, a more thorough explication can be provided. Heidegger puts

---

Heidegger, it is a manifestation of being." Frank Schalow and Alfred Denker, *A Historical Dictionary of Heidegger's Philosophy* (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2010), 221

forward the view that hermeneutics should not only be understood as the science of interpretation, but as the very act of interpreting interpretation itself.[350] Interpreting something means to find the horizon of the subject matter by placing it and being placed by it, where we can first come to have a "horizon" before we have a fixed "standpoint". The "discussion" that situates is precisely such a way of orienting ourselves in the context of the appearance of the thing, which suggests that with hermeneutics, the very ground of phenomenology itself becomes an issue for thinking. The hermeneutic underpinnings of phenomenology are what follows: in the attempt of understanding the thing, the "discussion" is precisely the act of situating the topic, as well as letting the topic itself situate us, so that we may have a better perspective from which we can view the matter. In other words, hermeneutics is a way of contextualizing the subject matter, while also letting ourselves to become a part of that context by interacting with it. Instead of merely endorsing a certain interpretation of the matter, it signifies the way in which we learn to see the issue from different angles and standpoints. This act of encircling the topic creates the *topos* of the act of understanding and interpreting where we can actually "grasp" the thing in its wholeness. Now let me explain further how this is linked to the issue of language and topology.

Heidegger's discussion of phenomenology in *Being and Time* shows that he understood phenomenology in terms of the appearance of phenomena through and *as* the very manifestation of *logos* itself.[351] The Greek word *phenomenon* derives from the verb *phaintesthai* meaning "showing itself". In that regard, Heidegger argued that, "Thus we must keep in mind that the expression 'phenomenon' signifies that which shows itself in itself, the manifest".[352] We can work with this early definition of the notion which is also

[350] (*On the Way to Language*, 11)
[351] (*Being and Time*, 51)
[352] (*Being and Time*, 51)

relevant for late Heidegger.[353] If phenomenology is the philosophical approach that engages with the very motion of self-manifestation, and if hermeneutics is the attempt that seeks to comprehend the ground upon which one understands and interprets the self manifestation of phenomena, then, in engaging with the question of language what Heidegger pursues is the following: undergoing an experience with the ground and horizon of the *site* in which our understanding/interpretation of the motion of self-manifestation becomes possible. Heidegger writes:

> I: What mattered then, and still does, is to bring out the Being of beings-though no longer in the manner of metaphysics, but such that Being itself will shine out, Being itself-that is to say: the presence of present beings, the two-fold of the two in virtue of their simple oneness […]
>
> I: Accordingly, what prevails in and bears up the relation of human nature to the two-fold is language. Language defines the hermeneutic relation.[354]

As can be observed here, the primary aim is to understand the source of the presencing that grounds the very two-fold, namely the self-manifesting relation between being and beings, which Heidegger calls the event. I claim that the nature of this self-manifesting relation is hermeneutic if and only if we understand the happening of language of the event as the source of the *relation*. This is so because it is through language that human beings have access to the appearance of things in a meaningful way, precisely because the relation that gathers being and human being in the same *place* appears *as* language: the way and the relation between human being and being that by and within which things appear *as* things is language. Therefore, topology of language is also a discussion of the ground and horizon of language.

Heidegger and Tezuka discuss the meaning and the nature of "hermeneutic

[353] I will discuss this issue in the fourth chapter in detail.
[354] (*On the Way to Language*, 30)

relation", and in this context the nature of "relation" becomes an issue on its own terms. Heidegger does not understand the word "relation" merely in the sense of "relationship" or "correlation" as that which connects two different entities or realms.[355] This is an idea that I have also explicated in the first chapter with regards to the idea of "the between". Heidegger conceives of the "relation" as an active occurrence, namely, as the constant un-folding of "the between" which gathers being and human being in place [*topos*] as the open bounded. The idea is that human beings cannot have an external (objective or subjective) "relationship" to the appearance of the two-fold which is grounded by language.[356] When we raise the question of the nature of language, the ground, the horizon and the phenomenon turn out to be the *same*, which is why talking *about* language is not sufficient, particularly if the matter at hand is to find a new relation *to* language. This is because it is language that: 1) situates the appearing of the manifestation of being in place and, 2) provides the horizon against the backdrop of which understanding and interpretation (taking things *as* things) become possible. The movement that is at issue must engage with the ground and horizon of the happening of the site that gathers and situates them in the same context. If to undergo an experience with language is similar to dancing, remaining a mere observer of a dancer means to theorize about language. Only by dancing with language we can understand what it is like to follow the rhythm that attunes language as the event. Likewise, in terms of our relation to language, we must learn to comport ourselves toward "the bearing of message"[357] in order to adapt to language's own vibrations and attunement. Being attentive to language, as the source of the "hermeneutic relation", places human beings in its belonging "nearness" where any interpretation as such becomes possible. In listening to language itself, our relationship to

[355] (*On the Way to Language*, 32)
[356] (*On the Way to Language*, 40)
[357] (*On the Way to Language*, 29.)

being can no longer be simply theoretical, for "listening" involves no "looking" from afar, but rather being-with in the sense of a moving-with in paying attention and following that which concerns us. Showing heedfulness to the source of the hermeneutic relationship refers to the kind of orientation that situates the human being in the proper nearness to things, neither too close nor too distant, but always journeying "the between" as the "relation".

In the course of the dialogue, Tezuka inquires about the 1921 lecture course titled *Expression and Appearance*[358] and the conversation returns to the discussion of the Japanese term *Iki*, the nature of aesthetics, and following that, the very notion of "relation", yet this time by way of clarifying the link between "object" and "subject". Tezuka asks for further clarification concerning the subject-object relationship:

> J: "Expression" is the utterance of something internal and refers to the subjective. "Appearance," on the contrary, names the objective, if I may here recall Kant's usage according to which appearances are the objects, the objects of experience. By giving your lecture that title, you did commit yourself to the subject-object relation.[359]

Heidegger admits that his thinking in 1921 was determined by the traditional aesthetic-philosophical paradigm, yet it is in light of this paradigm that his thinking advanced, allowing him to take issue with the origin of subject-object relation, [360] especially with regards to certain themes related to art. Tezuka's question requires Heidegger to explicate what it means to have a subjective or objective relation to a phenomenon in general. According to Heidegger, the aesthetic "experience" of the artwork turns it into an "object

[358] Kisiel recounts the biographical-conceptual genealogy of this lecture course in his work. See: Theodore Kisiel, *Heidegger's Way of Thought* (New York: Continuum, 2002), 11.
[359] (*On the Way to Language*, 36)
[360] (*On the Way to Language*, 36)

for our feelings and ideas."[361] Here the notion of experience is obviously used in a different way than when it denotes the kind of experience that one must undergo with language. On this note, we can say that Heidegger has two notions of "experience": 1) experience in the sense of "undergoing an experience with …", indicates a being and moving-with the subject matter, and letting it transform our nature to the extent that we incorporate it in our being. This is experience as *Erfahrung*. 2) In the case of "the aesthetic experience," we turn the thing into an "object" for our subjective will and desire without actually going journeying with the matter. This is experience as *Erlebnis*.[362] Here is an example: some people travel with the only purpose of having been in a place. One might walk for hours on the 5th avenue in the New York City as a tourist, yet this does not mean that one actually "experienced" what it means to "dwell" there as a business man, or a coffee shop owner whose life continues in the site. The tourist has only a superficial impression of the place without real substance. Once the "tour" is over, one returns to her or his old life as if nothing happened. Yet, there is also a mode of traveling in which one may prefer to live in a place for a longer period of time, speaking or learning the native language, and try to understand the culture of place in a genuine way. Such an "experience" transforms one's existence. Only the latter kind of experience is the one that involves "dwelling", which requires the onto-ethical participation of one's being in the place.

Now, the sort of "relation" that Heidegger criticizes is the one in which we objectify the artwork, situating ourselves as egoistic subjects over and against things as objects. As early as 1933, we know that for Heidegger the artwork, such as the Greek temple, indicates the emergence of the world within which phenomena appear to human

[361] (*On the Way to Language*, 43)
[362] This is a difference that Bernasconi also acknowledges in putting Heidegger in a dialogue with Hegel on the issue of experience. See: Robert Bernasconi, *The Question of Language in Heidegger's History of Being* (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1985), 82.

beings in their wholeness.[363] A true artwork has the capacity to redefine and transform the existing paradigms of our understanding, because it provides a new ground upon which things start making sense in a different way. It shows things anew to us by providing a new ground and horizon of understanding. The aesthetic "experience" of the artwork, however, remains a subjectivistic endeavour, since it understands the artwork solely as an aesthetic object of pleasure, or some kind cultural achievement, as something that evokes sentiments for the individual's aesthetic esteem. The same point is at issue with regards to language, as one's "relation" to it must not be objective or subjective. What that means is that we cannot get to the core matter of language insofar as our study of language remains attached to the investigation of language as "self-expression" and "communication" (subjectivism) or the scientific description of linguistic components of language such as phonetics and syntax etc. (objectivism). How can we let language orient our dis-course so that it may replace our "theoretical" position *vis-à-vis* language? Heidegger and Tezuka implicate that this would require a topological engagement when they say:

> I: Then, man, as the message-bearer of the message of the twofold's unconcealment, would also be he who walks the boundary of the boundless.
>
> J: And on this path he seeks the boundary's mystery.[364]

The topologically relevant idea here is the act of walking the boundary of the boundless. The openness in which we are situated that de-limits our relation to being itself is the site of the event, which becomes accesible insofar as human beings dwell in language. In turn, we maintain our relation to language if and only if we remain open to bearing the message, listening to language's own speaking. This is what situates us in the happening of language, just as this is when we let our discourse *on* language to be determined by our

[363] (*Basic Writings*, 168)
[364] (*On the Way to Language*, 47)

poetic relation to language. With this idea in view, we can say that inquiring into the place-character of language would be the originary source of "hermeneutic phenomenology", because inquiring into the meaningful presencing of phenomena (phenomenology) is rooted in the gatheredness of being and human being in the happening of the world. Yet, this means that the kind of "hermeneutics" that is at stake here is the one between being and human being in their situatedness in language where any interpretation (taking things *as* things) is possible, because it depends on the very capacity to say "it is", which also means, "there is". The saying of place (*logos* of *topos*) is what grounds the "hermeneutic relation" as the place of saying (*topos* of *logos*): it is topology.

Here we can take a step back and review the issue within the limits of Capobianco-Sheehan debate. Capobianco emphasizes that the kind of hermeneutics that is at work in Heidegger's later thought does not focus on the "discourse" or "dialogue" that takes place between human beings.[365] Capobianco's main concern is to avoid the reading that limits Heidegger's hermeneutics to the scope of "human inter-subjectivity". Although Heidegger's early thought can be investigated in terms of inter-subjectivity, later Heidegger's primary focus is not the understanding and interpretation of phenomena. Rather it is an inquiry into the correspondence between human beings and being itself. The "way" of this topological inquiry is the "discussion" that situates in place, and in effect, "situating-discussion" is the key to understanding the hermeneutic vein in Heidegger's later thought. This is an idea that also appears in the dialogue, one that Heidegger confirms himself.[366] The vey nature of the situating-discussion allows us to

[365] Richard Capobianco, *Heidegger's Way of Being* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 40.

[366] "I: I shall be glad to try, because the explanation may issue in a *discussion* [*Erörterung*] […]
J: In the sense in which your lecture on Trakl's poetry understands discussion.
I: Exactly in that sense." (*On the Way to Language*, 29)

problematize the nature of "hermeneutics" itself and this is the reason why Heidegger refrains from associating the position of his later thought with hermeneutics as such. This is evident in the following passage:

> I: It can hardly have escaped you that in my later writings I no longer employ the term "hermeneutics."
>
> J: You are said to have changed your standpoint.
>
> I: I have left an earlier standpoint, not in order to exchange it for another one, but because even the former standpoint was merely a way-station along a way.[367]

It is in that context helpful to review Sheehan's perpsective regarding the issue. Sheehan argues that Heidegger was all the way down a phenomenologist[368] and his phenomenology has hermeneutic underpinnings and implications[369]. Accordingly, Heidegger primarily understands human being as the kind of being that can have a relation to the world thanks to its hermeneutic sense-making capacity, as the result of the kind of existence that it possesses. However, according to Sheehan, Heidegger was at the same time after the "source of meaningful presence, whatever that source might be".[370] Sheehan states, "Everything is intelligible except why there is intelligibility at all."[371] In view of this, if Heidegger was after the "source" that from which the possibility of understanding/sense-making/intelligibility emerges, then, this would be language as the between [*das Zwischen*] of being and human beings, wherein it both determines and gathers the human being and being by allowing them to correspond to each other. This is because "the source" emerges through and *as* language insofar as we can conceive of it as the condition of possibility of the meaningful manifestation of being. If this is so, phenomenology as an

[367] (*On the Way to Language*, 12)
[368] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), xii.
[369] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, xii.
[370] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 129.
[371] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, 115.

endeavour looking into the appearance of phenomena itself is possible only via the topology of language, which inquires into the *topos* of the very occurrence where the appearing of phenomena becomes manifest. Therefore the place [*Ort*] that Sheehan mentions[372], without naming it as such, is language. It is the source, not in the sense of a mere point of origin, but as the happening of the source as sourcing. If this were to be a source somewhere "beyond" our meaning making capacities, it would never become an issue for us in the first place. Therefore, it makes more sense to consider the source as the event of language (which makes intelligibility possible) itself rather than mystifying the source of intelligibility as some sort of a meta-metaphysical origin beyond where we find ourselves situated in the world. The source is always and already "here", in the "there" [*Da*] where we exist. The question "why there is intelligibility at all" needs to be answered simply as follows: there is intelligibility because this question makes sense for us insofar as we find ourselves placed in language. This is our initial access to the "sourcing of the source", as language is the site of the between, where the event between being-human being itself "takes place".

Within this context, it would be accurate to say that from the very beginning of his thought, Heidegger was interested in preparing the readiness to situate the question of being as the question of language as place and vice versa, which first becomes possible as soon as we discern the hermeneutic relation between being, language and place[373]. Once Heidegger identified the sameness of the happening of the event as the gathering and disclosing essence of language, he no longer needed to appeal to phenomenology or hermeneutics as the method or the definition of his thought because he has already discovered a more encompassing explanation that grounds both hermeneutics and phenomenology. As Heidegger argues, the relation between being and human being

[372] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*, xviii.
[373] (*On the Way to Language*, 7-8)

"cannot be hidden in anything other than the voice that determines and tunes his nature"[374]. Accordingly, (1) Heidegger was after the source of the question of being via language as the happening of place because, (2) the question of being emerges from our situatedness in language as "the between", and (3) the topology of language is late Heidegger's way of issuing the origin of the *aletheia* of the meaning of being. Finally, (4) "situating-discussion" *of* language is the way and movement of thinking, which is the kind of approach that refrains us from viewing language objectively or subjectively, but by constantly reorienting ourselves in the very site of the event itself. Therefore we can infer that the later period of Heidegger's thought cannot be merely defined as hermeneutics, phenomenology, nor hermeneutic phenomenology. It is rather an attempt of grounding the "hermeneutic relation" *between* being and human beings, which signifies the topological nature of language as well as our dwelling in it. In that regard, when Sheehan suggests that Heidegger's "focal point was not Sein" and that he was primarily after the "meaningfulness and its source"[375], this requires a careful scrutiny. Initially, we can say that Sheehan makes a point because Heidegger's thought was not concerned with some sort of supernatural being as a god-like subject whose radiance illuminates all other phenomena. It is about *Ereignis*, which is not an entity, but the taking place of the openness of the coressepondence between being and human being, as that which grounds any presencing of the presence as such. Yet Sheehan's statement is also misleading because the gatheredness of the manifestation of being and human existence's openness to its manifestation in language is precisely what is at the root of the question of being [*Sein*], and this is beyond the question of being as meaning. The very correspondence in the site of being grounds the emergence of meaningfulness, so being does not amount to meaning,

[374] (*On the Way to Language*, 47)
[375] Thomas Sheehan, *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 10-11.

but to the interrelation between that which becomes manifest (phenomena), to that which can make sense of this manifestation (human being), and the very site in which the event takes place (language). Being itself, or *physis*, which Capobianco considers the core matter of Heidegger's thought, is the very unity of these distinct elements. An experience of being itself may be enacted if human beings manage to be able to respond to the event, which is the meaning of dwelling in language.

In light of these arguments, it is now evident that there is no possibility of encircling language as a mere object of investigation, because, as we have examined, it is the ground of the appearance of phenomena (phenomenology), and the horizon of the understanding and interpretation of that appearance (hermeneutics). Engaging with the ground and the horizon of that two-fold appearing is the task of the topological study of language. Now, having clarified that "situating-discussion" [*Erörterung*] is the "way" in which Heidegger raises the question of language, we can move on to discussing the nature of the "way" and "movement". This should bring to the fore the "way-making movement" of language as the happening of language as the *topos* of being.

III. 3 The "Way-Making" of Language

Thus far I have shown the way in which Heidegger problematizes the "way" of his discourse on language in *On the Way to Language*. This prepared us for understanding the appropriate mode of thinking that is needed for considering the nature of language. However, I have not explained the nature of the "way" itself, and how it might be connected to the place-related nature of language (the way-making movement) and the event, which will be the primary issue at hand in this section.

The "method" of discussing language as "situating" requires the correspondence of the "way" and the actual subject matter. This correspondence can be understood as the harmony between the issue and the method that Heidegger considers necessary for the poetic discussion of language. Namely, the subject matter should determine the way and vice versa. This is connected to the way in which Heidegger makes sense of the nature of the "way", when he writes, "Ways are not mere stretches that connect two places"[376]. The way (as the dynamic relation that constitutes the between) is what allows the boundary of place to appear as such. As I have suggested, the matter at hand is to review the relation in which we stand to language. If and only if we find the proper relation to language being itself can be appropriately experienced, because language is not just any relation, but the relation of all relations. This is exactly the same idea that I have explicated with regards to the notion of "the between" in the first chapter. Now the same idea is at work with regards to the relationship between "movement" and "way", yet even in a more explicit way.

First it must be noted that in German, "way" [*Weg*] and "movement" [*Bewegung*] are etymologically connected. In the essay "The Way to Language", Heidegger refers to *Be-wëgung* from the Swabian-Allemanic dialect of German, a word that implies the way that clears up a field and the movement that opens up space.[377] In other words, "movement" is the happening of "way" which shows forth the openness. If we look to the root of the word "way", we observe the meaning of "weighing" as "bearing", "carrying" and "moving"[378]. Therefore, there is a trifold link between "way", way-making", and "movement", that requires a closer look. Let me explain how this is also related to the question of the nature of language.

---

[376] (*On the Way to Language*, 92)
[377] (*On the Way to Language*, 129-130)
[378] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 822, 824.

In their dialogue, Heidegger and Tezuka attempt to find a fitting word that can help them in pondering the essence of the event of language:

> I: For long now, I have been loth to use the word "language" when thinking on its nature.
>
> J: But can you find a more fitting word?
>
> I: I believe I have found it; but I would guard it against being used as a current tag, and corrupted to signify a concept.
>
> J: Which word do you have?
>
> I: The word "Saying." [*Sage*] It means: saying and what is said in it and what is to be said.
>
> J: What does "say" [*sagen*] mean?
>
> I: Probably the same as "show" [*zeigen*] in the sense of: let appear and let shine, but in the manner of hinting.[379]

In this instance, it becomes clear that one of Heidegger's aims in *On the Way to Language* is to distinguish "saying" from "speaking", and explicate how saying and speaking are linked. Topologically understood, "saying" designates the way-making movement of language. In phenomenological terms, "saying" is the disclosive gesture of language that Heidegger uses in the sense of making manifest, yet not in the sense of "laying bare open". To show something rather means *letting* something to come into appearance, which requires us to provide it with the needed space in which it can move. As Heidegger formulates it: "This way-making puts language as language into language."[380] What that means, as I will discuss in detail, can be reformulated as follows: The relation between the emergence of meanings from silence and their manifestation into the sounded word is the

[379] (*On the Way to Language*, 47)
[380] (*On the Way to Language*, 131)

"way-making" movement of language. In other words: the event becomes manifest not only via language, but also as the "way-making" of language. Heidegger suggests:

> The moving force in Showing of Saying [is] what brings all present and absent beings each into their own, (from where they show themselves in what they are, and where they abide according to their kind. This owning which brings them there, and which moves Saying as Showing in its showing we call Appropriation (the Event) [*Ereignis*].[381]

Let me explicate the topological underpinnings of this point further by looking into the nature of the "movement" that is at issue.

Heidegger considers "saying" [*Sage*], which he understands as the primary function of language, as that which opens up space, in the sense of creating a "clearing" [*Lichtung*].[382] "Saying" is the "way-making" motion of language as that which allows for the two-way "movement" [*Bewegung*]. The making that is at issue here should be primarily understood in the sense of creating (as in "making room" [*einräumen*] for something), but not in the sense of "production".[383] Heidegger emphasizes that the "way" of language can be considered the most hidden yet the most powerful "stream", which also reminds us of the way in which he discussed the essence of rivers in the mid-1930s and the early 1940s via Hölderlin's poetry. As I have shown in the first chapter, Heidegger already recognized the source of the river, its streaming activity, and its discharge into the sea as the unity of the event. The source, the stream and the mouth of the river constitutes a singularity, a place that is gathered and concentrated in its own occurrence. Now,

[381] (*On the Way to Language*, 127)
[382] Perhaps one could even say that if "saying" is that which opens up the clearing of being as *Da-sein*, then "saying" would be the highest and the most virtuous action on the part of human beings. In that sense, "saying" would require a constant openness to listening to the emergence of being itself, as well as a capacity to bring that listening into the boundaries of speech by "saying".
[383] It could also be conceived of in terms of "poetizing", in the sense that I used in the first chapter as "making space" for dwelling.

Heidegger comes to claim that, "All *is* way"[384], which requires a close scrutiny with regards to the inner "movement" of language. Heidegger argues:

> Saying keeps the way open along which speaking, as listening catches from Saying what is to be said, and raise what it thus has caught and received into the sounding word. The way-making of Saying into spoken language is the delivering bond that binds by *appropriating*.[385]

What that means is that in order to understand the "event of language", which is its "way-making movement", we need to focus on "saying". In the quoted passage, Heidegger's emphasis is on the gathering nature of the "way-making", the same sense of unity that is also at issue in the statement "all is way". The expression of the "delivering bond" is the key expression here, particulariy indicative of the way in which the intrinsic motion of the "way-making" establishes unity. Accordingly, what does "saying" designate? It is first and foremost "deliverance". It can be thought in line with the original meaning of "way" as "weighing" and "carrying". Yet, what does the "saying" deliver? It does not simply deliver the "meaning" of a word or expression, but rather the event of language itself. It brings the *world* of understanding, interpretation and expression into the word that bears the meaning of that which we want to say. The very motion of *bringing into* the uttered word is what "saying" accomplishes and this is where we see that the action and the occurrence that brings the world of meaning into the sign is distinct from the sign itself.

Now, although "saying" is not mere expression, and it is certainly distinct from mere discourse, this does not mean either that it is completely detached from them. Every "speech" emerges *from* saying in that without the possibility of "saying", we would not have "speech" either. We "speak" because we want to "say" something in order to indicate that "this is so" or "this is not so". I show how the state of affairs is via language. In turn,

[384] (*On the Way to Language*, 92)
[385] (*On the Way to Language*, 131)

"speech" makes this "audible". Yet, it is not certain at all that what we "speak" will actually achieve to "say" what have in mind. As a matter of fact, each meaning of the word may conceal another one.

Within this context, it is interesting to consider the 20th century Japanese philosopher Ueda's topological ideas on language. Ueda is a third generation thinker from the Kyoto school whose thinking develops his teacher Nishida Kitaro's topologically oriented explorations of the pure human experience in attempting to overcome the "object" and "subject" dichotomy via looking into the "logic of place" [*basho no ronri*]. Ueda's thinking aims to show how object-subject division is preceded by a more primary experience of being in the world, which comes to the fore in our limit experiences of language. What he calls "hollow words", as we see in the sayings of Zen tradition or poetry, can disclose the openness of language, as well as our finite situatedness in language.[386] A scrutiny of Ueda's understanding of the role of hollow words may show forth the relationship between language and nothingness, which must be thought in terms of the interplay between showing and hiding, appearing and disappearing. Ueda claims:

> The words of language (*kotoba*) show things, events, or states-of-affairs (*koto*). Words express or manifest things; at times they can be said to manifest while expressing them. Therein lies the power of language. Moreover, as things are revealed, they disappear as words. This is the wonder of language. In the process of showing something, a word disappears as word and in its place something appears as something.[387]

This has two significances: first, the words do not simply indicate the meaning of things, but they make manifest the world in which they are meaningful. Second, when the ordinary meaning of the words becomes the primary focus, we risk losing our poetic

[386] James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo, ed., *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011), 765-766.
[387] Ueda Shizuteru, "Language in a Twofold World", in: *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo, 766 .

relation to the words. This latter point comes at the expense of overlooking the core matter of language and the necessity to undergo a poetic experience with the appearance of the words, but it is also what enables human beings to communicate in the factual world, which constitutes the two-fold essence of the issue. If the primary objective is to first undergo an experience with language, then the logistics of meanings via communication (the transportation of meanings *via* sign-words) can be pushed into the background. Yet, with this in view, Ueda comes to grasp a very significant point: language, as the primary condition of our meaningful being in the world, is "space-making", inasmuch as it is a "limitation". In allowing us to say what we want to say, the nature of language disappears. This is a topic that requires careful attention to grasp the relationship between phenomena and the words.

Ueda's topological thought of language brings into view the two-way movement of language, which is related to the question of the "ineffable". Is the nature of language inside or outside of language? Can we express the being of language by speaking about it via words? There are two extreme views in this regard: 1) everything is in language, because even the question of the nature of language appears within the boundaries of language. For instance, even the expression "outside of language" does not exist outside of language. 2) We can move "outside of language", since language is used as an instrument which obstructs our immediate access to pure experience. The real nature of language cannot be expressed in and of language. Now, Ueda offers a third way: the dynamic movement of "exiting language and then exiting into language",[388] which is a movement that the poetic words reveal. It signifies a movement from and into silence where the core matter of words becomes explicit, yet, neither "within" nor "outside" of

[388] Ueda Shizuteru, "Language in a Twofold World", in *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011), 768.

language, but at the very "limit" of language. This is an experience that strikes us in the case of being at a loss for words. Precisely when we experience the gap between the "word" and the "thing", this is when being itself overflows us. The overflowing of being comes to appear at that limit which, if thought of in a Heraclitean way, neither conceals nor discloses language, but hints it. This is where Ueda comes to link "nothingness" with language in the movement that takes place into and out of it. What has been traditionally called "being" in Occidental thinking as the very nature (*physis*) of any manifestation in the world, is "nothing" within the context of Oriental thinking, which is where Heidegger and Ueda's thinking can be reviewed in the same framework.

According to Ueda, the world in which we meaningfully exist cannot exhaust the significance of the happening of being; as such it is located in the limitless openness, which he defines as the "hollow" space of "no-meaning".[389] This creates the two-fold nature of the structure of human existence in the world in terms of its exiting into and out of it.[390] Now let us focus on different stages of that movement. In order to show the significance of "hollow words" and our situatedness in the infinite openness, Ueda interprets the poem of a child who lived near the lake Nojiri in Nagano prefecture, with the title "Evening Glow". The poem reads as follows:

The sun sets between Mt Kurohime and Mt Myōkō;

[389] Ueda Shizuteru, "Language in a Twofold World", in *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo, 769.

[390] At this point, Ueda remarks that this very movement into and out of language brings to the fore what we call the phenomenon of "religion". His comparison of various religions and language, as a particular concentration of his thought on Eckhart's mysticism, is noteworthy, yet a subject that I cannot explicate in detail here. It is perhaps useful to mention that, according to Ueda, the motion of exiting from and into language is what Eckhart's mysticism closely observes as its subject matter. For the religions of faith with a systematic theology, on the other hand, language becomes an issue as the word of God mediated from His realm to our everyday worlds. His words constitute "sacred texts". It can be interpreted that the mystic's relation to language where it aims to experience the movement of language is topologically closer to Heidegger and Ueda's understanding of the nature of language as a "way-making" that commences its movement from the limit.

Just then an orange cloud
Smoothly passes before my eyes.
Carrying the day's events, the cloud drifts along.
I was studying at school—
Is it watching that, I wonder?[391]

The point that Ueda wants to show by examining the poem is the fact that, when we speak with words, the own nature of language gets concealed. In speech, we take words as signifiers of phenomena and states of affairs in the world. However, he argues that the fourth line of the poem indicates a significant contrast with the preceding three lines. The fourth line, "Carrying the day's events, the cloud drifts along", does not simply designate what things are, but also brings our attention back to the words themselves, and to the fact that what is said in the fourth line can *only* be said in language: The clouds carry day's events, drifting along. This is not an "event" that is present in the world as such, but nevertheless, it can become available to our understanding in and with language, which has the capacity to re-orient us in our understanding of the world. It is in this sense that language can display the very happening of the world even in cases the world itself remains mute. In this case, language *silently* expresses the "hollow" thing, and as such provides the thingness of the thing.[392] Yet, the thing-nature of the thing appears from an "originary nothingness" which, as the basic event of language, is implicated in the last line: "Is it watching that, I wonder". The agent is no longer the mere subject of the action of seeing, but he also becomes that which is to be seen by the cloud. My seeing of the orange cloud is no longer the question, but the issue is abandonment of one's ego, and one's situating oneself in the presence of one's own being not as a self, or as we can also say, as a "selfless self". Ueda astutely describes this as follows: "While actually existing

[391] Ueda Shizuteru, "Language in a Twofold World", in *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011), 772.
[392] Ueda Shizuteru, "Language in a Twofold World", in *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011), 774.

in the world, at the same time we hollowly exist in the limitless openness in which the world is located. By means of language we, who are located in this twofold manner, come to awaken to our actual hollow existence."[393] This limit experience that we attain by dwelling in the self-happening of language as the open-boundedness of the world, as well as the experience of hollowness that emerges from this nothingness, is where we come to see necessity to understand language not only as a possession of human beings that they can control and manipulate at will. In opening up the world of meaning as well as letting us enter into the hollow space that encircles existence, its two-fold movement situates us in place as *topos*, which means *open-bounded*. In letting ourselves to be de-limited by the very happening of language, we stop merely talking "about" language. We let our own existence to become a matter of "discussion" as well, since the world, which becomes manifest via language beyond ourselves, shows us something about our place in the world.

Ueda's way of pointing out the significance of "original nothingness" and its relation to the two-fold experience of the language and the world, show another significant dimension of the topic. Ueda's ideas on the issue, especially with regards to the necessity of seeing the core matter of language moving beyond the subjectivistic understanding of language as a mere presence of meaning, is also one of the footholds of Heidegger's thought. Heidegger criticizes the three main characteristics of our traditional understanding of language, whose foundations were laid out by Aristotle and further solidified by Humboldt's philosophy of language: 1) language is expression, 2) language is an activity of human beings, and 3) human expression is a representation of the real and the unreal.[394]. In order to critique this understanding of language, Heidegger looks into the question of language not only as human speech, but rather as language's own speaking

[393] Ueda Shizuteru, "Language in a Twofold World", in *Japanese Philosophy: A Sourcebook*, ed. James Heisig, Thomas P. Kasulis and John C. Maraldo, 776.
[394] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 190)

through human speech. In that sense, we can say that, like Ueda, Heidegger sets out to point out the ways in which language need to be considered beyond the philosophy of meaning and signification, and he emphasizes the very role of silence and listening to the stillness of language. Silence is the mode in which language itself speaks, just as the very emergence of being itself happens via its no-thingly essence.

The poets are capable of "saying", because they are able to heed the emergence of the world of meaningfulness via silence. In Heidegger's dialogue with Tezuka, the idea of "bearing the message" appears as the way of relating ourselves to the silent emergence of the words. Now, Heidegger claims:

> In the naming, the things named are called into their thinging. Thinging, they unfold world, in which things abide and so are the abiding ones. By thinging, things carry out world. Our old language calls such carrying Bern, *bären*—Old High German *beran*—to bear; hence the words *gebaren*, to carry, gestate, give birth, and *Gebärde* bearing, gesture. Thinging, things are things. Thinging, they gesture—gestate—world.

The crucial idea that comes to the fore again here is that insofar as "bearing" must be understood as a "gesture", one by which we come to "hint" the thing through the un-folding of the world. Therefore, "saying" as the essential occurrence (way-making) of language is not about the deliverance of "meanings" from one point to another. What saying delivers is not the meaning of the words as if they are immediately available "standing-reserve". Therefore, the "words" do not carry "meanings", but first and foremost they "bear" (and give birth to) the emergence of meanings. The poetic word achieves this by way of "naming" and "hinting", which "situates" the subject matter (or the thing) in its belonging world. Heidegger claims, "Things bear world. World grants things"[395]. In this granting, language grants its ways that in and through which humans

[395] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 199)

need to walk. This is the meaning of walking the boundary of the boundless that has become a topic in Ueda's thought, which also situates the human at the limit of the two worlds, where, for Heidegger, the relation of all relations becomes possible as "the between". In other words, the "way-making" of language situates the human being in the proper distance to the self-manifestation of being as "no-thingness", where the question of being, and not the question of "beings" [*Seiende*] can appear in the first place. The "way-making", then, does not primarily indicate a linguistic movement, but first and foremost, it maintains the relatedness of human being and being by gathering them in the between, at the limit. The taking place of the relation is the happening of the way.

After having examined Heidegger's thought in the same context with Tezuka and Ueda, now, providing some historical and philosophical background about the notion of the "way" can help us to better comprehend Heidegger's arguments concerning the nature of language as the "way-making movement". In the 1950s, the Far Eastern thought appears as an essential source for Heidegger's thinking. The reason is that Heidegger thought that with the help of Far Eastern thought, it could be possible to understand what Occidental thought could not say of being and language. Likewise, many Japanese and Chinese scholars found Heidegger's thought extremely useful in identifying and elucidating certain characteristics of Oriental philosophy. In that framework, starting from the late-1940s and 1950s, Heidegger attempts to bring Occidental and Far Eastern traditions of thought into dialogue.[396] Heidegger sought the traces of a poetic mode of thinking, which he found in the Far Eastern tradition. He thought that Far-Eastern thought does not tend to ponder through "sign-words" (the mere representation and images of words), but with the "hints" that invite us to heed words as words, listening to what they

[396] Paul Shih-yi Hsiao reports about their common attempt with Heidegger to translate Lao-Tze's *Tao Te Ching* into German, which was never completed: Paul Shih-yi Hsiao, "Heidegger and our Translation of the Tao te Ching", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 93–103.

make manifest.

Heidegger draws our attention to the thought of Lao-Tze, who was an ancient Chinese thinker and writer who lived around 6-4th century BC, and the reputed author of the *Tao Te Ching* (or *Daodejing*). It is clear that in *On the Way to Language*, when Heidegger mentions the relation between "way" and "word", he has Lao-Tze's use of *Tao* (or *Dao*) in mind, which primarily means "way" among its other meanings and connotations.[397] Heidegger urges us to think on the relation between the Taoist notion of "*Tao*" and the Alemannic–Swabian words *wëgen* and *be-wëgen*, which can be understood as the "way–making, clearing movement".[398] Now, this way-making movement is key in understanding how Heidegger explains the topological relation between speaking, saying, and silence, as well as the relation between "words" [*Worte*] and "signs" [*Wörter*]:

> To clear a way, for instance across a snow-covered field, is in the Alemannic-Swabian dialect still called *wëgen* even today. This verb, used transitively, means: to form a way and, forming it, to keep it ready. Way-making understood in this sense no longer means to move something up or down a path that is already there. It means to bring the way ... forth first of all, and thus to *be* the way.[399]

Having pointed out the role that Eastern thinking played in Heidegger's later thought, let me elaborate the idea of stillness and silence, which is related to the nature of the "way" as a "hinting" gesture and indicative of the hollow nature of language. In that regard, let us return to the dialogue between Heidegger and Tezuka.

---

[397] May finds similarities between Heidegger's "*weg*" and the Daoist notion of "*Dao*". May suggests that the parallel drawn between "way" [*weg*] and "*dao*" also revert to the Heraclitusian "*logos*" in Ancient Greek. As such, May argues that for Heidegger, the event of being and language are closely related, the traces of which Heidegger also seeks to track down in Far Eastern thinking. See: Reinhard May, *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work*, trans. Graham Parkes (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 40.

[398] Otto Pöggeler has delivered one of the most significant studies on the issue in juxtaposing Heidegger's thought with Lao–Tzu. As such, he also addressed the topological relationship between *Tao* and *Logos*. See: Otto Pöggeler, "West–East Dialogue: Heidegger and Lao–Tzu", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes, 51.

[399] (*On the Way to Language*, 130)

After having clarified the way in which they must "situate" the question of language, Heidegger and Tezuka slowly make their way into discussing the nature of language and saying through their dialogue. They call the way in which the words grant themselves in the course of a dialogue a delicate gesture, namely, a beckoning, or hinting [*winken*]. Hinting is the way of "showing". In other words, "saying as showing" (*sagen*/*zeigen*) follows the way of "hinting". Heidegger and Tezuka come to define the significance of "hinting" through their discussion of the Japanese notion of *Iki*. In relation to the way they set out to discuss the "way-making" of language, they come to designate the meaning of *Iki* as the "pure delight of the calling stillness".[400] The term is particularly important for the role that it plays in Japanese arts, which appears as a way of making things manifest through stillness and tranquillity. *Iki* is the way of showing, yet a showing that issues from and *as* stillness. It is not a mere demonstration, but hinting of the appearing motion of the appearance itself. This means that it is not we as subjects who "show" the phenomenon. We only assist (let) its self-manifesting motion in its moving toward us by preparing (clearing, opening and protecting) it's way. As such, one must first prepare oneself for the self-manifestation of being itself (as no-thingness) by comporting oneself appropriately, bearing its birth, that is, paying heedfulness for the stillness that is the source and the way of the kind of "showing" that is at issue.

This point is connected to the way ("method") of the "discussion" as situating. What is significant is not so much arriving at the meaning of the notion of *Iki*, but heeding the "way" through which it arrives at our understanding, as we undergo an experience with language. As such, the "discussion" first attempts to arrive at the "stillness", which Ueda called the "hollow" nature of language, infinitely open to nothingness. Now, it must be noted that the "stillness" that is at stake here does not indicate mere muteness as the

[400] (*On the Way to Language*, 45)

absence of speech or sound. Speaking, saying and silence are not three distinct present beings "correlated" by some linguistic process of signification and correlation called the "way-making". Likewise, nothingness does not mean the mere absence of things. "Stillness" is the way of "silence", as that through which silence appears, just as nothingness as the way of being, at that through which no-thingly nature of being comes into view.

Silence, as the "way" of "saying" embodies the hinting gesture of saying, which becomes manifest in speaking. Manifesting something through speaking, saying itself becomes manifest via silence, which is the "way" of stillness. That means, that which comes into the sounded word, the sign, is that which has become shown (signified), yet its proper gesture of "hinting" belongs to the "saying". "Saying" shows, issues from and *in* the mode of silence. We first hear that which is spoken but not that which is said, and how it is brought into the saying from stillness. In other words, silence "hints" ("signals") the "word" via saying, which is delivered to the "sign". A work of art, namely a painting, is essentially "word-less", yet it silently delivers the message in the mode of "saying". The painting can transfer a particular world of meaningfulness to us, without having to utter words, yet, we still understand the painting, as it shows forth the happening of a world. The problematic aspect of philosophies of language is that they do not take into consideration that silence is an essential aspect of language. The incapacity of the word to represent the thing in its entirety is taken as a failure and thus silence is immediately associated with muteness.[401] Heidegger's thinking specifically underlines the fact that a

[401] The threefold relationship between speaking, saying and silence can perhaps make more sense if thought with regards to the early Wittgensteinian problem of quietism, especially in terms of whether Heidegger would support the proposition "whereof one cannot speak, thereof one must be silent" or not. (Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, proposition 7, trans. G.F. Pears and B.F. McGuinness (London & New York: Routledge, 2001), 99.) Here, differing from Heidegger, Wittgenstein makes a categorical distinction between "speaking" and "silence", and locates them in different regions. Here, "remaining silent" means something like staying mute, and thus it is used in opposition to "speaking". On the other hand, for Heidegger every "saying" has a

word or conception of language that is capable of disclosing the nature of language does not exist because language is not a static object.[402] Likewise, in the course of the conversation, it becomes evident that Heidegger's earlier notion of "house of being" should not be conceived of as a conception of language either, a point that Heidegger and Tezuka underscore.[403] The "house of being" is only a hint that appeals us to approach the question of language from a new perspective with a new orientation in thinking. This new kind of thinking requires us to acknowledge the limits of language, namely, the fact that discourse is surrounded and bounded by silence. In that regard, the significance of silence about the nature of language comes to the fore:

> J: We Japanese do not think it strange if a dialogue leaves undefined what is really intended, or even restores it back to the keeping of the undefinable.
>
> I: That is part, I believe, of every dialogue that has turned out well between thinking beings. As if of its own accord, it can take care that that undefinable something not only does not slip away, but displays its gathering force evermore luminously in the course of the dialogue.[404]

Speech communicates the "way" of language to others by speaking it.[405] In that sense, "speaking" shelters the "deliverance" of the subject matter by following the "way" of saying. Now, though the sign preserves and encompasses the saying, its function is not to deliver the meaning. That said, insofar as the movement that the "way" discloses is always

---

silent source and not any "muteness" signifies "silence". Therefore, Wittgenstein's approach is metaphysical in that it thinks the relation between speaking, saying and silence only in terms of the presence and absence of signs within the traditional paradigms of linguistic theory. Heidegger's thinking does not advocate "quietism", for the quietness that is at issue in that metaphysical heading is thought in terms of muteness or lack of speech.

[402] (*On the Way to Language*, 127)

[403] "No, those conceptualizations are not what I have in mind. Even the phrase "house of Being" does not provide a concept of the nature of language." (*On the Way to Language*, 22; see also p. 25, 26.)

[404] (*On the Way to Language*, 13)

[405] "I: What are you thinking of now?
J: Of the Same as you have in mind, of the nature of language.
I: That is what is defining our dialogue. But even so we must not touch it." (*On the way to Language*, 22)

two-fold, there is also the possibility of tracing the "word" moving from the "sign". The appropriateness of the signs with which we speak plays a major role in allowing us to attend that which the saying hints. It is through the sign(s) that we journey back and forth within the boundaries of communication. As Heidegger argues elsewhere, "If we go to the fountain, if we go through the woods, we are already going through the word 'fountain,' through the word 'wood,' even if we are not saying these words aloud or have any thoughts about language."[406] As such, the "sign" of the "word" allows or disallows the word to be represented in such a way that it may or may not bring us to the "way" itself. The "sign" is not the same as the "word", but only the image and form of it. Because the "saying" (showing as hinting) belongs to the "word", and "sign" can only "speak" that which we want to "say".[407] This is the sense in which the idiosyncratic formulation "bringing language into language as language"[408] should be understood.

In recent Heidegger scholarship, Ziarek draws attention to Heidegger's topology of language in relation to the way-making character of language.[409] His explorations of Heidegger carries out a significant task in expounding the silent nature of the "way-making" of language, where our letting language speak via the poetic saying remains the key point of focus instead of our speaking with and about language. Ziarek has two arguments: First, "What Heidegger terms the "way-making" (*Be-wëgung*) movement of language provides the context, or topologically speaking, the region, from which all signs and signification unfold."[410] The second argument is that Heidegger's aim is not to construct a "meta-discourse about language in language".[411] As such, "language must be

[406] (*Off the Beaten Track*, 232-233)
[407] (*On the Way to Language*, 61, 123)
[408] (*On the Way to Language*, 59)
[409] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 78.
[410] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 80.
[411] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 16.

conceived in its essential occurrence."[412] Accordingly, there are two opposing ideas that need to be reconciled. On one hand, we avoid objectifying language and on the other, we nevertheless attempt to say something about the nature of language. The solution is that even if we cannot entirely escape talking about language, our discourse on language must develop out our non-objectifying experience in language. As our examination of Ueda has also showed, the issue of language is two-fold, yet not in a dualistic manner. On the contrary, any attempt to stand in a poetic relation to the essence of language must initially acknowledge the two-fold nature of our situation in language so that at the limit of language our relation to it becomes a topic on its own accord.

I have discussed that Heidegger and Tezuka both understand "hinting", and not merely "signifying, as the basic characteristic of the words.[413] Saying is possible with the words, because saying does not mean the transportation of meanings from one mind to another. One does not "say" with the "signs" in the sense of transferring a "meaning", since what is "transferred" in any case is the world that the words make manifest. Said differently, the "signs" do not bring us to where we need to go, but they only show us the way and they bring us to the way of thinking. It is our own responsibility to trace the path that the "signs" *signal* to us. According to Heidegger, in the history of philosophy it has become our commonplace attitude toward language that we consider "signs" (as chiffres) as the images of various concepts. Our incapacity to make sense of what these conceptions historically have been "saying" in different epochs of being is the very source of the metaphysical relation in which stand to philosophy. This is why these "signs" need to be constantly de-structured so that their metaphysical connotations become explicit and come apart in order to awaken a mindfulness of thinking. Restoring our relation to language can stimulate this awakening, and also reorient us in the site of thinking:

[393] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 80.
[413] (*On the Way to Language*, 24)

> J: Hints and gestures, according to what you indicated, differ from signs and chiffres, all of which have their habitat in metaphysics.
>
> I: Hints and gestures belong to an entirely different realm of reality, if you will allow this term which seems treacherous even to myself.[414]

Here, it is clear that Heidegger and Tezuka distinguish "hints and gestures" from "signs and chiffres". Nevertheless, this does not mean that "words" that hint and "signs" that signify belong to completely different dimensions. This is obvious in the dialogue when Heidegger states that we could not think without "concepts", not because we need them, but because the conceptual way of thinking, "insinuates itself all too easily into every kind of human experience".[415] There is no thinking that has access to "pure" signs, just as there is no "pure" language where words always mean what they are designed to mean. It is in the nature of words to turn into signs, because words are not meant to "signify" as they fail to objectify the substance of things. What is in their capacity is to beckon towards the movement that takes place in the occurrence of things, opening up horizons in which we may attempt to think.

If one does not experience the way-making movement of language, thinking turns into a mere application of readymade chiffres as symbols, using words merely as objects. In such an application of the "sign", we fix the meaning of the "word" by attaching it to a certain representation of the thing, where the "word" turns into a tag-word. As such, the "sign" only fills the space that is left empty by another "sign", in which case the possibility of an experience of the "word" withdraws. We can call this process the instrumentalization of language. What Heidegger critiques is then the total technicization

[414] (*On the Way to Language*, 25)
[415] (*On the Way to Language*, 25)

of language such that we come to consider language as a tool of information that only consists of "signs and chiffres".

Now, if the matter at stake is transforming the relation in which we stand to language and undergoing a new experience with it, then, we must dwell in the region between the "signs" and the "words" by journeying there. This is the basic condition of finding a poetic relation to language where we may first clear up the ground upon which we can build and dwell. This is what Tezuka means when he says, "A manner in which the builders must at times return to construction sites they left behind, or go back even further."[416] In finding a poetic relation to the "there" [*Da*], human beings travel the interval back and forth between the word and the sign. The "signs" that we use in ordinary language are not technical-instrumental images of the words. On the contrary, if considered carefully, the "signs" leave traces that signal back to the poetic experience of the "words". The poet is the agent who is capable of appropriately travelling the way between the "word" and the "sign". By naming the "word" in a way that the "sign" that is assigned to the "word" attunes our being, the poet can hint the way-making movement of language. Likewise, the thinker should be topologically experienced in order to be able to show us the "way" departing from the "sign" toward the "word". The experience [Er-*fahr*ung] of the thinker and the poet must be this constant two-way journeying [*fahr*en] in the nearness of thinking and poetizing. This is the neighbourhood of thinking and poetizing as the site of the two-way journeying from the "word" to "sign" and vice versa that within which language situates human beings in their dwelling place.

[416] (*On the Way to Language*, 21)

III. 4 *Koto Ba*: The Blossoming of Words

Thus far I have explicated the "way" of "discussing" language and the way-making movement of language as the essential occurrence between silence, saying and speaking as the moments of the interval between "words" and "signs". Here, I will discuss the definition of language that Heidegger and Tezuka come to identify at the end of the dialogue, which will be helpful in fleshing out the topological essence of the way-making nature of language.

In the course of the dialogue, Heidegger demands from Tezuka to explain the word "language" (or any word that comes to mean "language") in Japanese.[417] The word that Heidegger asks about turns out to be *koto ba*[418], which Tezuka comes to utter only at the end of the dialogue after long hesitation and contemplation, just as was the case with the other Japanese notion *Iki*. Tezuka starts explaining the "source" of the "meaning" of *koto ba* only when he is convinced that they have opened up the required space for saying the word. In this way, they both know that the Japanese word for language shall not be taken as a conception of language, but only as a hint. While Tezuka repeatedly warns Heidegger concerning their "way toward the reality of language", Heidegger responds by saying that it may be even sufficient to build a "bypath" at this point, namely, a pathway that shall

[417] "I-What does the Japanese world understand by language? Asked still more cautiously: Do you have in your language a word for what we call language? If not, how do you experience what with us it called language?" (*On the Way to Language*, 23)

[418] May's translation of Tezuka's text in which Tezuka reveals the actual details of their encounter is highly significant for several reasons. First of all, it shows that both Heidegger and Tezuka sincerely engaged in a dialogue, although Heidegger at times tries to objectify the Japanese *koto ba* in line with his own conceptions. Secondly, it appears that the etymological background of the word *koto ba* is not an inventive word play on Heidegger's part. The original text of Tezuka appeared in: Tezuka Tomio, "Haidegg to no ichi jikan" ("An Hour with Heidegger"), in "Kotoba ni tsuite no taiwa" ("From a Conversation on Language"), Haidegg zensh (Complete works of Heidegger) 21 (Tokyo, 1968; 3rd edition: 1975), 159–66. Reinhard May, *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work*, trans. Graham Parkes (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 61.

take us to the way of language.[419] This "bypath" is their attempt to arrive at the designation of language as *koto ba*, yet only with the reservation that even the Japanese expression that speaks the essence of language should not be taken as a tag-word. It should be thought as a hint [*Winke*] that will appeal us to reconsider our relationship with language.[420]

> J: [t]he word is a hint, and not a sign in the sense of mere signification.
>
> I: Hints need the widest sphere in which to swing…[421]

The hinting character of saying makes the space in which one can freely move *between* the "word" and the "sign". The motion of "swinging" here is indicative of the nature of the two-way movement that takes place between the "word" and the "sign". In swinging, the motion is tranquil and it is in accord with the nature of the showing as hinting. The topological character of the event of language becomes apparent in that very "relation" *between* the "word" and "sign", which may remind us of the relation of the emergence of being into beings and the two-fold relation that the event embodies. The motion has a swinging character; as such it does not denote a one-way, linear, or pre-defined movement precisely because the way is not a mere "route", but the boundedness of open space where a freeing movement can take place. The way is distinct from the "route" in that the former opens and clears the space, while the latter only lets one to get from the point A to the point B. *Koto ba* comes to the fore *via* the "way" of language, in the swinging movement from the word to the sign and vice versa. Now, let us focus on the meaning of *koto ba* having clarified its ground and horizon.

---

[419] (*On the Way to Language,* 26)
[420] (*On the Way to Language,* 24)
[421] (*On the Way to Language*, 28)

In the dialogue, we observe that *koto ba,* literally meaning "words", implicates the blossoming of flower petals, namely "appearance of a bloom". The occurrence of the words is described in the text as the gracious gesture from stillness, in relation to the Japanese term *Iki*.[422] The second part of the word "*ba (ha)"* has the sense of "density" and "abundance". In this particular case, it may be interpreted as leaves and blossom petals. *Koto* means, "the matter, affair, state of affairs", as well as "taking place of an event" and "happening of a thing".[423] The Japanese expression that bespeaks the nature of language in the sense that Heidegger understands "saying" is *koto ba,* which implicates the happening of abundance of words, and in particular, the emergence and arising of words from stillness. The reason why Tezuka does not choose the more ordinary Japanese word *gengo* (language as *Sprache*) is because he aims to find a designation of language that hints at the dynamic activity of the way-making of language. In this way, he refrains from defining language merely as discourse or communication. *Koto ba* signifies the poetic way of conceiving the nature of the words because it discloses the way in which the "words" appear in their hollowness.

Graham Parkes explains the etymological background of *koto ba* further by drawing on the Chinese characters that we see in the Japanese word. Accordingly, the first part, *koto*, signifies the sense of end and origin, –edge or border– beginning and end.[424] It is interesting to observe the semantic parallel between the German *Ort* and Japanese *Koto*, as the German expression for place also has a meaning of edge and limit.[425] Another

[422] (*On the Way to Language,* 45)
[423] Reinhard May, *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work*, trans. Graham Parkes (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 62.
[424] Graham Parkes, "Afterwards–Language", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 214.
[425] "This conception of place connects, in English, with the way in which the term 'place' is itself derived from Greek and Latin roots meaning 'broad', or 'open way,' as well as with the sense of 'place' associated with the way in which the intersection of roads in a town or village may open out into a square that may itself function as somewhere in which events and people may gather and perhaps even as the center for the town or village as such. The idea of place as tied to a notion of

similarity arises is that Japanese allows for a rich interpretation of the image of petals that can be thought as the mouth of a flower. This resembles many Occidental words representing language such as *lingua*, which mean *tongue* as the organ of speech.[426] Here, the phenomenon of language is associated with the organ as that through which we express ourselves. Drawing our attention to the possibility of larger understanding of language, Heidegger aims to emphasize the difference between discourse and language, as in German "speech" [*Sprache*] stems from "speaking" [*sprechen*]. The word *koto ba* does not simply signify the sign that designates a "flower", but rather it implicates the "emergence of the flower petals" in their occurrence from silence to speech. The word is the silent "tuning of being" which makes its way to the sign, as the sounded word. The journeying of the "words" spring from silence passing through "signs" only to descend back to silence, because the "sign" can never say the "word". The word's return to silence is its homecoming, which is the same as the petals' descend back to the earth. The circular movement of nature and language in *topos* is the same in that they make manifest the same event that takes within the boundaries of being bounded by no-thingness. In that sense, *koto ba* indicates the unfolding of "no-thingly" essence of being and language from the place of no-thingness.

The dialogue on *koto ba c*an also be read as a poetic discussion of the essence of a tree. In doing so, the way in which Heidegger sees the relationship between the *physis* of saying and the saying of *physis* also comes to the fore. The way-making movement of *koto ba* is the same as the activity of the tree. The movement that "saying" enacts in language "is" the gathering of the roots and the blossoming petals in a singular site. The roots, the

---

gathering or 'focus' is also suggested by the etymology of the German term for place, *Ort*, according to which the term originally indicated the point or edge of a weapon the point of a spear, for instance —at which all of the energy of the weapon is brought to bear." Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 29.

426 (*On the Way to Language*, 47)

trunk, the branches and the petals of the flower become unified in the singular emergence, constituting a singular *topos*. Here, the place of the tree is no longer another property externally attached to the tree, but rather, the body and the spacing of the tree constitute the place in its wholeness. The tree faces the sky rooted on the earth, both open and bounded. In fact, the higher it grows in reaching the sky, the more encompassing its roots become in grasping the earth. The upward movement from the roots to the petals embodies at the same time the downward movement from the petals to the roots. The flower petals that silently blossom from the earth allow the word to offer itself as the sign. The emergence of the word is the happening of the way as the body of the tree as the movement is the emergence from the earth, nurturing the tree through the roots, body, branches which arrive at the flowers that turn into fruits. As such, according to Heidegger, the happening of language is to be sought precisely at that interval (as the dynamic between) that gathers the word and the sign in the same active movement.

We should be aware of the fact that the sameness of the emergence of the tree from place and the emergence of the word from does not imply a metaphorical transfer of meaning from one domain to another. It is not as if there is the physical activity of trees from which we derive a sense of "occurrence" and project upon the essence of language. As I have addressed in the first chapter, this is similar to the sameness of the way of dwelling of the river and the poet. The becoming of the tree from which the petals grow and the words from which the signs emerge are the same. Their sameness precisely indicates that they are not identical. Sameness can be possible insofar as we have at least two non-identical, distinct elements. Their sameness appears in that they bring out the *event* in the same manner in a way that they mirror each other.

Here we can explain further the spacing between the word and the sign, which the taking place of *koto ba* shows forth. The space that stretches between and gathers distinct

ends of language becomes manifest in the saying. In view of this, the "word" and the "sign" do not appear as two fixed points.

As I have explicated earlier, the boundary as limit [*peras*] has two defining characters that give the place its essence: openness and boundedness. Likewise, "way-making" both provides the "boundary" in the sense that it makes room [*einräumt*] within which the movement between the "word" and the "sign" can take place. It de-limits and gathers them in "the between", yet the boundary is also essentially "open", as it is de-limited and encompassed by silence from both ends, so that the place can remain as the clearing of being. It is the open-bounded nature of the "way" that permits the event to occur in and through the space. If the words and the signs appear as the ends of language, and if the limit (*peras*) is where the presencing of phenomena commences, then, the "word" and the "sign" also define boundaries after which the "in-definite" commences. The opening that extends into the "in-definite" is de-limited by the boundary that gathers the "word" and the "sign", which is place (*topos*). As *koto ba* designates the blossoming of the plum and cherry petals, we can conceive of the Japanese experience of the happening of language *same* as the happening of place. This means, "words" and "signs" constitute the boundaries of language, which is the place of journeying for human existence. In other words, the movement between the "word" and the "sign" is what discloses the "there" [*Da*]. These boundaries disclose the "place of saying" and "saying of place" via the "way-making".

The discussion of *koto ba* brings out the idea that we should stop making sense of language in terms of the self-expression of the "living-being". For it has been traditionally considered within the boundaries of this framework, language has been primarily associated with the organ of speech as "tongue", "lingua", "glossa" (i.e., in Turkish *dil* means both language and tongue as well). Indeed, in the course of verbal communication

we speak words with the help of the organs such as the lips, teeth, tongue, as well as the muscles that move these organs. In this regard, Heidegger makes an interesting claim: "But the mouth is not merely a kind of organ of the body understood as an organism – body and mouth are part of the earth's flow and growth in which we mortals flourish, and from which we receive the soundness of our roots"[427]. Let us elaborate this claim.

Heidegger understands "body" in terms of space and place, in particular as the "relation" and as "the between". The body embodies and provides the spacing by that which things are gathered in the same spatial nearness. In terms of the structure of human experience, the body is also the limit that from which "I" can move from my "inside" to "outside". The body is the limit of my first-person experience of the world in that it spatially seperates me from that which is beyond me, and it is precisely this seperateness that can distinguish my place, and determine my nearness or distance to other phenomena in space. Therefore, inasmuch as my body is what places me in my "being-myself", it also allows me to have a relation to my "non-being", that is, the space outside of me. The immediate space of my "self" appears in its wholeness thanks to the mutual placing and displacing characteristic of the body. As such, the body is not only that which encompasses one's "spirit", not a mere "instrument" that serves to preserve one's "consciousness" of the world, but by first creating and mediating the space between the "self" and the "external world", it is that which allows one to *be* as such in the first place. In that sense, language can be also understood as the body of human existence. It embodies things in "the between", gathering and disclosing the nearness in which the things enter into and exit from the world of meaningfulness.[428]

---

[427] (*On the Way to Language*, 98-99)

[428] For more on the issue, Vallega-Neu's ideas are stimulating and need consideration, given the fact that "body" is a matter that Heidegger's thinking has not been sufficiently addressed. Daniela Vallega-Neu, *The Bodily Dimension in Thinking*, Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2005.

Now, the body of the tree, which holds together the constant occurrence that correlates the earth, the roots, the trunk, the branches, the flowers and the fruits, is "the between". It is the "relation" of the corporeal being-there of the tree which separates it from what it is not, yet still ties to place. The slow yet the constant movement of the sap that nourishes the tree relates the underground with the sky. The "saying" which moves everything by its occurrence interrelates the appearance of the word with its disappearance. In that regard, the flower is the "same" as the river, which performs the same relation making movement with the two ends of the place, situated in *being*, yet encompassed by no-thingness and emptiness [*mu/wu*]. This is the context in which Heidegger mentions Hölderlin's hymn "Germania" twenty years later after his first lecture courses and states, "language is the flower of the mouth".[429] Hölderlin's poetic saying, "language is the flower of the mouth", resonates with the meaning of *koto ba* as the emergence of the words as flower petals. This is the sense in which the "saying" of language must be thought as the "event" of being in its inexhaustible self-manifesting emergence as *physis*, which now brings us to the following formulation: The event of language (*is*) the language of the event.

III. 5 The Event of Language: The Language of Event

Understanding the relationship between the "way-making movement" of language and the event of (as) language is essential to grasp the core matter of Heidegger's topology of language. The event of language becomes an issue for Heidegger as early as the mid-

[429] (*On the Way to Language*, 99)

1930s in the *Contributions* and remains the key idea onwards.[430] In that context, it is useful to bring into view Ziarek's examination of Heidegger, in problematizing the link between "topology" and "topography" of language, which will help us to explicate the nature of the relationship between the event and language.

In *On the Way to Language*, Heidegger sets out to explicate the essence of language in the essays titled "The Way to Language" and "The Nature [*Wesen*] of Language". These two essays complete one another. Heidegger problematizes the title "*On the Way to Language*." He emphasizes significance of appropriately understanding what it means to be on the "way to language"[431], as there is a double sense here that needs close attention. First, if we are on the way to language, it means that we are not there. However, if human existence always already finds itself in language, there is no way to get there. This seemingly paradoxical situation puts forward the "hermeneutic circle", or as we can also call it, the hermeneutic *topos* in and through which we must approach the question of language. The possibility to undergo a new experience with language only appears within the boundaries of our existing relation to language. Our situatedness in the "hermeneutic circle" is what allows us to interpret language different than a mere tool of communication, while it is also that which allows us to approach the question of language via language itself.

It is within that context Heidegger reformulates the title of his essay as follows: "The Nature? Of Language?"[432] It should be noted that Heidegger places the word nature in quotation marks. It indicates that inasmuch as the nature of language is at stake, our thinking is also moving in a direction where the nature (or essence) [*Wesen*] itself

---

[430] Martin Heidegger, *Contributions to Philosophy: Of the Event*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012), 21 (From here on: *Contributions to Philosophy*)
[431] (*On the Way to Language*, 111)
[432] (*On the Way to Language*, 70)

becomes an issue, which shifts the focus of the discussion to the relation between language and being. In talking about the sameness of being and language, Heidegger essentially considers the ancient Greek notion of *logos*. Heidegger argues:

> The oldest word (or the rule of the word thus thought, for Saying, is *logos*: Saying which, in showing, lets beings appear in their "it is". The same word, however, the word for Saying, is also the word for being, that is, for the presencing of beings. Saying and Being, word and thing, belong to each other in a veiled way, a way which has hardly been thought and is not to be thought out to the end.[433]

As I have explicated in the chapter on the "Letter on Humanism", Heidegger acknowledges Aristotle's designation of the human being as "*logon echon zoon*", agreeing with the fact that human being's existence is distinct due to its relation to *logos*.[434] That said, Heidegger does not conceive of *logos* as the faculty of reason of the subject, but simply as language, which instantaneously shows forth the happening of being itself as the event. *Logos* means "gathering" and "laying" considering the fact that it derives from the verb of *legein*. In that sense, the way in which he perceives *logos* essentially implies the correspondence between human being and being. In order to draw on the non-subejctivistic nature of the happening of language and the manifestation of being itself, Heidegger reverses the phrase by underscoring that it is language that "has" the human being. Because the happening (disclosing-situating-gathering) of being as the event is not "humanly" [*menschlich*], in the sense that it is not a human production. Within this context, the "discussion" of the sameness of the "way-making" of language and the event comes to the fore in his review of the last stanza of Stefan George's 1919 poem titled "The Word". It reads as follows:

[433] (*On the Way to Language*, 155)
[434] (*On the Way to Language*, 111-112)

So lernt ich traurig den verzicht: Kein ding sei wo das wort gebricht.

So I renounced and sadly see: Where word breaks off no thing may be.[435]

In reading the poem, we must let language itself attune us rather than attempting to come up with a philosophical interpretation of it. Initially, the poet appears to be "pointing out" that we cannot make sense of things if our words for the things are lacking. What this means is that words name objects, and in the absence of signs with which we represent objects, there can be no understanding of things as things. This would be a "correct", but also a simplistic reading. We know that even at times when speech comes to a stop in the moments of astonishment, forgetfulness, shock, anger and such, we can still relate to objects. For instance, if I want my friend to pass me the spoon and if for some reason I cannot remember the word "spoon" which signifies the object, then, I can express myself in another way and say, for instance, "will you pass me that thing" simply by pointing to the spoon, and my friend will immediately get what I mean by that. This is because we already know the context in which the sign-word "spoon" can be employed. Insofar as the context can immediately "signify" the object, the "sign" itself can be dropped. The "sign" operates like a "password" or a "chiffre" that we enter in order to access a bank account or e-mail address. Even at times when the "password" is lost, there are ways to re-access it, for instance, by means of security questions or a backup e-mail address where we can create a new "password". I can use body movements, facial gestures, or expect my friend to understand the meaning simply by guessing from the context.

Now, there is still another and more significant register of George's poem that concerns the relation between the words and the things. What the poet does is "naming" the event of the language as the language of the event. The essence of naming is "calling",

[435] (*On the Way to Language*, 60)

especially in the sense of calling into "nearness".[436] The nearness that is at issue does not indicate mere spatial proximity: "Two isolated farmsteads -if any such are left- separated by an hour's walk across the fields can be the best of neighbours, while two townhouses, facing each other across the street or even sharing a common wall, know no neighbourhood."[437] In naming things, the poet does not aim to provide an image of things, but invites us to think the taking place of the world through the word and vice versa. It is in that sense that naming as calling is different from giving a name or a title for an entity that stands over and against us. In attending the call of the poet, we are invited to think the world via the word, which the poem makes manifest in its wholeness. George names the word, although this is not because a representation of the "words" lacks. Naming situates the human existence (*Da-sein*) precisely between the interplay of *Da* and *Sein*. The event is the "way-making movement" between the "there" and "being".

Before venturing too far in reading into the poem, Heidegger's thought invites us to consider the following question: is it appropriate to make a propositional claim about the poem? What do we perform when we infer philosophical claims such as, "something is only where the appropriate and therefore competent word names a thing as being and so establishes the given being as a being."[438]? According to Heidegger, such an explanation may be useful for philosophical and literary studies, but when it comes to experiencing the words, it is not sufficient. What is primarily needed is not only a literary or philosophical clarification of the poem, as if the poet's words are mere representations of sentiments that lack "argumentative clarity". In this way, "We would have reduced poetry to the servant's role as documentary proof for our thinking, and […] in fact we would already have

[436] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 196)
[437] (*On the Way to Language*, 103)
[438] (*On the Way to Language*, 63)

forgotten the whole point: to undergo an experience with language."[439] Therefore, for Heidegger, the matter is not the mere interpretation of the poem, but actually to make sense of the way in which the poet comes to undergo an experience with the words. The event is concealed in the silent way-making movement of language and this is why it needs to be "thought", and not only be technically "explained". This is because thinking does not mean the mere conceptual analysis of the sign-words, but more so engaging with the infinite openness of language, within the boundaries of "saying".

So far, my discussions focused on the disclosive character of the way-making movement of language. However, in that regard, we must address the disappearance of meanings since the truth of being (*aletheia*) is a two-fold occurrence. Ziarek draws attention to the fact that the interval that exists between the "word" and the "sign" actually emerges from our incapacity to say the word.[440] He argues that for Heidegger, the event is essentially something that becomes manifest in the failing nature of language,[441] though the failing characteristic of language is not a matter of signification. For instance, the wrong or inaccurate definition of a phenomenon is not the failure that is at issue. On the contrary, the more dangerous concealment of language occurs when we think that we have exhausted the meaning of a word. We think that we have fulfilled the function of language in the course of an intelligible communication. However, a more profound experience of language allows us to attend the interval between the word and the sign. Indeed, this is an idea that we observe in the *Contributions to Philosophy,* one that remains to be significant in *On the Way to Language* as well.[442] The word that will speak the nature of language resists coming into the boundaries of speech, and this "concealment" is the very core

[439] (*On the Way to Language*, 63)
[440] "When the word fails, when it does not reach dictionary words, that is, signs, the word, as it were, escapes and frees itself from signs. This escape marks the opening of the interval between signs and words, and as such it constitutes the hint if being" Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 81.
[441] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 81.
[442] (*Contributions to Philosophy*, 30)

matter of the relation between words, being and nothingness. On this note, Heidegger argues:

> Concealment can be a refusal or merely a dissembling. We are never fully certain whether it is the one or the other. Concealment conceals and dissembles itself. This means that the open place in the midst of beings, the clearing, is never a rigid stage with a permanently raised curtain on which the play of beings runs its course. Rather, the clearing happens only as this double concealment. The unconcealment of beings—this is never a merely existent state, but a happening."[443]

The so-called "negative" character of the happening of language –which makes it both possible and yet difficult to undergo an experience with it– is related to the fact that the word is not a linguistic image of the object, but it constitutes our linguistic relation to things. The word is primarily the happening of and the originary emergence from the event. Yet, as we have seen with the Japanese expression of *koto ba*, the meaning(s) of the word spring in abundance as flower petals. This means that there is no such thing as *the* meaning, but always a series of related *meanings* dependent on the context in which they are employed. Each saying discloses a certain signification while concealing others, and it is in this interplay that the event shows itself in concealment through the failure of words. The failure [*Ver-sagen*] of the saying [*Sage*] is its own most accomplishment [*vollbringen*] in its completion and wholeness.

In *On the Way to Language* Heidegger takes issue with Humboldt's treatise *On the Diversity of the Structure of Human Language and its In Influence on the Intellectual Development of Mankind* in order to show why we need to take a step back from a subjectivistic understanding of language. Heidegger argues that this treatise, "in an open and covert *pro* and *con,* has ever since determined the course of all subsequent philology

[443] (*Basic Writings*, 179)

and philosophy of language".[444] Heidegger specifically looks to *De Interpretatione* where Aristotle suggests: "[t]he letters show the sounds. The sounds show the passions in the soul and the passion in the soul show the matters that arouse them."[445] In view of this, Heidegger's central critique of Humboldt's understanding of language is its subjectivistic underpinnings, which he considers the continuation of the Aristotelian paradigm. Humboldt sees language as the chief source of human subjectivity that through which human beings posit their inner selves. Humboldt entertains the idea that language is a "human achievement" because of human beings' "inner mental activity".[446] According to Heidegger, in following Aristotle's way of thinking, Humboldt finds the very basis and essence of all language in the articulated sound. The sum total of articulated sounds, which express the inward thoughts and feelings of their speakers render language as the instrument by which they perceive and express their life-worlds. Language allows for the inwardness of the existence of a people to take specific forms, which, in turn, is expressed through the articulated sounds. Humboldt calls the totality of these sounds and expressions the outward form through which the relevant understanding of the world is expressed. According to that view, language is a product of the labour of human mind. It is a subjective mechanism, where the subject finds its "voice" in the language that speaks the mind of its people, which belongs to the nation and the race of that very people.[447]

---

[444] (*On the Way to Language*, 116)

[445] (*On the Way To Language*, 116); Aristotle, *Categories and De Interpretatione*, trans. J.L Ackrill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 44 (16a3).

[446] Underhill argues that Humboldt's engagement with language is a result of Leibniz's philosophical influence on him, but also his close relation to Hamann and Herder. In that framework, Humboldt's account of language grapples with two theories of language, namely, the "vehicle theory" and the "mirror theory" that were popularized in the 18th and 19th centuries. In the former, which is a position considered by Descartes as well, language appears as an instrument that allows human beings to express their ideas. In the latter, language appears as the reflection of the mind, and in specific, of thought. James W. Underhill, *Humboldt, Worldview and Language* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009), 58.

[447] Wilhelm von Humboldt, *On Language. The Diversity of Human Language Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, trans. Peter Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 27, 30, 37, 41.

Humboldt writes, "Language is the outer appearance of a spirit of people."[448] The ways in which the words are deployed are the articulated and vocalized expressions of the intellect of its people. Consequently, ideas get transmitted through signs, because language is the organ of "thought". In that regard, language is regarded as the expressive activity of intellect, that is, of human subjectivity.

For Humboldt, the link between language, mind, self-cultivation and education (or formation) [*Bildung*] is particularly important. In that regard, he advocates the humanization of the most isolated corners of the world in light of enlightenment ideas.[449] In contrast with his account, Heidegger places the human being in the interplay between being and language, yet does not assign a primary role to the human beings. He rather renders the human being as the receptive end of that correlation. This is the first foothold of his critique of subjectivism. The other one is the fact that subjectivism is bound to see the core matter of language in terms of "meaning", but not the coming to appearance (and disappearance) of meaning through the "truth of being" via place. Insofar as "meaning" and its communicative transportation is what is at stake language remains a human "possession".

The key question in that regard is the following one: how can we dwell in language so that we do not conceive of it as a mere container of meaning, the expression of human subjectivity –i.e., the reflection of the spirit, self-expression of the subject, or the worldview of a people– but as the event itself? The problematic aspect of Humboldt's account is that, if we see language as the labour and product of human intellect, we also consider the way in which human being makes sense of the world as the only meaning of

[448] Wilhelm von Humboldt, *On Language. The Diversity of Human Language Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, trans. Peter Heath (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 46.
[449] Wilhelm von Humboldt, *On Language. The Diversity of Human Language Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*, trans. Peter Heath, 35.

the world, thus, human being appearing as the sole meaning-giver. This is precisely what leads to the technological objectification of the earth, which gets in the way of dwelling and resulting in the shrinking of the boundaries of the fourfold.

In order to be able to dwell, we also need to acknowledge the concealing nature of *aletheia*. This would allow us to make sense of the world beyond mere human ideas, projects, wills, and calculations. This, indeed, is a topological issue insofar as it is concerned with the place of the human being and how we orient ourselves in the world. In terms of our relation to language and *aletheia*, we must seek for the opening, the "rift", that will show us the "failure" of language, and our being, which will bring us back to our proper place in which we may dwell.

In that framework, Ziarek suggests that Heidegger's topographics of language opens up another dimension of topology of language[450], summoning us to pay attention to Heidegger's distinctive ways of writing. His topographics of language shows forth the silence that breaks out from the happening of language. In that regard, Ziarek states how Heidegger moves from "language as *symploke* to topology"[451] in his application of "topographics of language". There is a two-fold issue: first, the topology of language encompasses the way in which human existence stands in the clearing of being and how it attends the way-making of language, which takes place beyond human makings and productions, simply determining and attuning them. Second, dealing with language in a topographical way may awaken us to acknowledge the silent "way-making" of the words in the writings of literary and philosophical writers. The "topographics of language", which can underpin the ways in which the situated essence of language is in-scribed into the signs, allows us to break open into the clearing by abandoning the sign as the sole

[450] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 160.
[451] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 67.

image of the word. We are invited to think without and beyond images. That is to say, we must be able to think even in instances where the image and representation of the appearance of phenomena are lacking, and thus we must avoid associating phenomena with images when the matter of investigation is not an entity. This would be the way of thinking *from* the event.

Heidegger's topographics of language comes to the fore as he pays a particular attention to George's use of the colon:

> So I renounced and sadly see:
> Where word breaks off no thing may be.

The colon that follows the word "see" initially suggests as if the poet aims to provide an explanation. Grammarians call such a mode of speech "direct discourse".[452] However, what next line of the stanza does not provide a statement. This is because George does not simply write "is", but "may be". Heidegger argues: "What follows the colon does not name what the poet renounces; rather, it names the realm into which the renunciation must enter; it names the call to enter into that relation between thing and word which has now been experienced."[453] In that regard, a topographical reading of Heidegger's claims brings us again to the ancient Greek notion of the limit or boundary [*peras*]. If the limit indicates the commencement of the boundary that brings the place to the openness, and if the colon carries us into the realm that it renders open, then, the colon appears as the "relation", that is, as "the between", which discloses the space of the "there". This is where the limit experience of language takes place. Indeed, our experience cannot be solely situated *at* the colon, but it starts from the colon. Now, this does not mean that the entire meaning of the poem is dependent on the use of the colon. The poem cannot event come to a bodily

[452] (*On the Way to Language*, 63)
[453] (*On the Way to Language*, 65)

existence without the "signs". However, the use of the colon here has the potential to change our approach to language. The colon does not allow us to read the poem as a text that merely describes a state of affairs in a fancy, artistic way. Such an attitude to the text fades if we manage to encounter the "rift" that grounds the poem in its entirety. The colon discloses the space in which we can experience the occurrence of language by appealing us to read the poem by heeding the event that un-folds. Our dwelling in the *topos* of language – or as we can indeed say, in language as *topos* – commences not *in* or *at*, but *from* and *by* (*à partir de*) the limit. In other words, the limit is where the way-making movement of language commences. In this way, we have the chance to focus on the core matter of the "words". Heidegger applies the same topographic mode of "thinking" in pondering the relation between being and language. He writes:

The being of language: the language of being[454]

This formulation serves like a "guideword", which is not designated to tell us what the being or language "is", but only to signal the way in which their "relation" needs to be thought. We should not reason that the expression "the being of language" is to provide information about the substance of language, which would imply a representational mode of thinking. What we are seeking is not the "origin" or the "cause" of language. For instance, even the idea of "way-making movement", which we considered the essence of the happening of language, does not amount to "the being of language". Now, the second part of the formulation following the colon invites us to encounter the "same", yet not "identical" expression in an inverted way.[455] The colon invites us to make sense of the fact that "being" is not an entity, just as language does not signify mere "discourse".

[454] (*On the Way to Language*, 94)
[455] This "twisting" move is also suggestive of the idea of "overcoming [*Ver-windung*] of metaphysics.

First, both "being" and "language" must be considered in their verbal forms (*Sein* and *Sagen-Sprechen*) in their presencing and co-responding to one another: being as the event, and language as the saying as that which situates the human being in its dwelling place, the neighbourhood between thinking and poetizing. The "topographics of language" mentioned by Ziarek here beckons us to examine the topological spacing that the colon yields. The use of the colon is unusual, that is, unfamiliar and uncanny, as it emerges from the hollow expanse of language. Instead of "designating", it gestures towards the relation, that is, the original emergence of meanings in and from silence. The colon derails us from our commonplace mode of reflection in which we consider the words as the carriers of meaning. Yet, by refusing to bring the words into a mere "equation" of identity, it leaves each section of the expression open to the "difference" of one another in their sameness. The openness that is disclosed by the un-defined element of the "statement" is precisely what also de-limits and thus bounds them. In a certain sense, the colon functions as the "in-bound" of the two-way movement of the "thinking" and "poetizing" that is at issue, putting them into interplay, letting them entering into their respective fields by enveloping one another. In that context, Ziarek talks about the "dis-humanizing" [*Entmenschung*] effect of language, which is an idea that requires us to understand Aristotle's *zoon echon logon* differently.[456] Human beings do not possess language, but rather, they become "owned" [*eignet*] and "appropriated" [*geignet*], and "attuned" [*stimmt*], therefore "determined" [*be-stimmt*] by language. Here, Heidegger "de-structs" the possessive nature of the equation, and transforms it into a relation of mutual "belonging" [*gehören*], where the true possibility of listening [zu*hören*] becomes possible. However, this is possible only insofar as we think language as that which situates the human existence in its dwelling place, and not as that something by which human beings produce meanings.

[456] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 16-17.

Within that context, Ziarek writes: "Language is 'of' the event, necessitating human participation in carrying itself into signs, while not being limited to or explainable through human language. In this fundamental sense, language is not human for Heidegger, that is, it is not human in its essential occurrence (*Wesung*)."[457] The "essential occurrence" of language is both its "failure" and "accomplishment" (its concealment as that which is concealed), the latter in the sense of its coming to completion and fullness. The word arrives at the sign in abundance of ways, and as such, there are many "ways" of saying the "same" matter. Here, the etymological relation between saying [*sagen*] and failure [*versagen*] is particularly important.[458] Each time the word "fails" [*ver-sagt*] to present itself as an object, being itself comes to manifest itself in concealment. This is where the source of the word lies in its leap into the site of being. Each time the word fails to come to the signs, it changes its course, "folding" into "manifold" of meanings.

One question that we can raise here is the following one: just by looking to the etymological background of the "sign", can we actually undergo an experience with the "word"? It is clear that Heidegger does not endorse the view that mere etymological explanations can allow us to find a different relation to the words and language.[459] The experience [*Er-fahrung*] that is at stake in the sense of "journeying" becomes possible once we acknowledge that the word can hint at a context of interrelated meanings and connotations. We must journey through different appearances of the words. Looking to the etymology of words is the same as following the footmarks on an abandoned path. The footmarks do not provide us with the directions, but they can give us some hints

[457] Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 74.
[458] Ziarek emphasizes the "fault" of language as "folding" and "de-fault" in a double sense. Krzysztof Ziarek, *Language after Heidegger*, 74.
[459] "The truth, then, here and elsewhere, is not that our thinking feeds on etymology, but rather that etymology has the standing mandate first to give thought to the essential content involved in what dictionary words, as words, denote by implication." (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 173)

concerning our positioning and help us to see understand the topography of the place where we are walking. Let me explain with an example.

In Turkish, the root of "*ko*(*n*)-", meaning "to land, to be situated", evolves into "*konuşmak*". In attempting to show forth the "same" matter in different ways, each time the stem can come to "de-signate" different meanings, such as "*konu*" (subject, matter, topic), "*konut*" (house), "*konum*" (position), "*konumlandırmak*" (situate). The same root word "*kon*-" is capable of designating both "to situate and place" and "to speak", yet in the difference between "to speak" and "to situate", this double meaning remains implicit. When I say, "to speak", it can only bespeak something related to discourse and language, though we cannot hear the meaning of "to situate and place". One meaning that it discloses conceals the other one. This "folding" movement "un-folds" the place of the word, which brings us to the site of being in which the event appears in silence. As such, it invites us to think, not the "meaning", but the "un-folding" of "meanings" in their particular and correlated movements. This is where we can conceive that "the being of language" *is* the same as "the language of being", which bring into view the two-fold relation between un-concealment and concealment (*a*-letheia). In "folding", "un-folding", and even "en-folding" in the sense of "enveloping", language makes manifest, just as all becoming manifest is language.

Heidegger concludes the essay by writing:

> An "is'" arises where the word breaks up.
>
> To break up here means that the sounding word turns into soundlessness, back to whence it was granted: into the ringing of stillness […] This breaking up of the word is the true step back on the way of thinking.[460]

[460] (*On the Way to Language*, 108)

The occurrence of "breaking up" at issue here is beckoned by the colon, which appears as the "inbound", as that which situates us at the boundaries of language. Just as in basketball one must in-bound the ball to re-start the game after the ball goes "out of bounds", our thinking must also recognize the limit experience of language entering into and from it. Such an experience can be possible insofar as we "situate" ourselves within the boundaries of the interplay between speaking, saying and silence. Silence allows human beings to journey the site of intelligibility in its entirety, for it is via silence, which is the infinite openness of language, human beings may "enter" into the boundaries of language. To be able to "hint" at the silence without talking about the silence would be "authentic saying"[461], which is the essence of the "method" of language as "situating-discussing". Human beings must learn to listen to the ways in which language itself speaks, before they endlessly discourse on it.

III. 6 The Obstruction of the Way of the Event: *Gestell* as The Framework

I have shown that the "situating" nature of the "discussion" brings us to the "way" of language and the "way-making movement" of the event. The silent "way-making" of language must be granted in order to be able to "situate" our existence in the nearness of the originary occurrence of being, that is, the word's gesturing the world (by the simultaneous and two-fold placing and displacing). The silent beckoning of words call us to "thinking" and "poetizing", instead of "calculating" and transporting meanings from one domain to another as signs. Now, while such a mindfulness of language allows us to make an issue of the relation in which we stand to being, the essence of modern technology appears as the "obstruction" of the "way-making" movement of language and

[461] (*On the Way to Language*, 65)

the event. Therefore, here I will address Heidegger's critique of the essence of modern technology, and the technicization of our relation to things. As such, in this section I set out to explain how the "way-making" of language to which we have arrived in the course of our "situating-discussion" is set in opposition to "the framework" [*Gestell*] as the essence of modern technology.

Heidegger's critique of technology takes its most elaborate form in the late 1940s and onwards. It is important to note here that Heidegger's more sophisticated thinking of language and place, and his critique of technology develop simultaneously, which is also the period of his thinking where the topology of being and language becomes explicit.[462] Here, I will flesh out Heidegger's critique of technology based on the topological link between language and technology. The key idea is the necessity of identifying the role of the "machination" [*Machenschaft*] of the world (a term that is specific to the mid-1930s) that transforms all things and the constituents of the fourfold (sky, earth, immortals, mortals) into manipulable objects.

In the essay "The Turning" (1949), Heidegger argues: "Language first gives to every purposeful deliberation its ways and its byways. Without language, there would be lacking to every doing every dimension in which it could bestir itself and be effective."[463] Heidegger's words here direct our attention to the place-related basis of our relation to things the role that language plays in that regard. We enter into each realm by traversing language, which determines the horizon of our understanding and makes things a matter of experience for us. Our understanding of the essence of modern technology too develops

[462] For some important critical engagements with Heidegger on the issue see: Andrew Feenberg, *Questioning Technology*, London & New York: Routledge, 1999; Herbert Marcuse, *Technology, War, Fascism. Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse*. vol. 1., ed. Douglas Kellner, London: Routledge, 1998; Iain Thomson, *Heidegger on Ontotheology: Technology and the Politics of Education*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
[463] (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 40–41)

out of our relation to language[464], while the framework can also determine our relation to language in a destructive way. The two-way connection between language and the framework requires a topological scrutiny.

First, let me focus on the background of the word "technology". We can break down the expression into two components and examine each one separately. In the first part of the expression, we find the notion of *techne*. Although we usually understand "craft" and "art", the background of the notion suggests a richer set of implications. In "Building Dwelling Thinking", Heidegger claims: "The Greek word for 'to bring forth or to produce' is *tikto.* The word *techne*¸ technique belongs to the verb's root *tec.* To the Greeks *techne* means neither art nor handicraft but rather: to make something appear".[465] Here, it is evident that Heidegger considers the "essence" [*Wesen*] of *techne* (namely, via its temporal-spatial unfolding) in the same line with other ancient Greek notions such as *logos*, *aletheia, poiesis*, *and physis*. Similar to the notion of *poiesis*, he suggests that we should make sense of *techne* merely as production. The craftsman's task in "making" is to follow the basic happening of the nature as *physis*[466] as the self-manifestation of the emergence of all things. There are certain "technologies", which do not fix our relation to things, and they nevertheless bring out the *physis* without oppressing it. For instance, Heidegger states: "And certainly a sawmill in a secluded valley of the Black Forest is a primitive means compared with the hydroelectric plant in the Rhine River"[467]. The hydroelectric plant transforms the natural flow of the river. Its streaming becomes an

[464] One of Heidegger's most elaborate discussions on the relationship between technology and language is the following one: Martin Heidegger, "Traditional Language and Technological Language", trans. Wanda Torres Gregory, Journal of Philosophical Research, Volume XXIII, (1998): 129-145.
[465] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 157)
[466] "Not only handcraft manufacture, not only artistic and poetical bringing into appearance and concrete imagery, is a bringing-forth, *poiesis*. *Physis* also, the arising of something from out of itself, is a bringing-forth, *poiesis*. *Physis* is indeed *poiesis* in the highest sense. For what presences by means of *physis* has the bursting open belonging to bringing-forth, e.g., the bursting of a blossom into bloom, in itself". (*Question Concerning Technology and other Essays*, 10)
[467] (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 5)

endlessly orderable supply of energy. The crucial point here is not only the environmental problems that arise from our unethical use of technology. The more challenging problem is our relation to modern technology, a point to which I will turn in brief. With their current relation to modern technology, human beings manipulate, organize, and "enframe" *physis*, the very natural growth and emergence of all things. Now let me focus on the second component of the expression of technology, namely, *logos*.

In his 1934 lecture course titled *Logic*, Heidegger had attempted to show the connection between language as *logos* and logic.[468] In the 1950s, Heidegger challenges the "logic" of modern technology. After delineating what is peculiar to logic, Heidegger discusses the ways in which the technical understanding and application of *logos* transforms how we experience our being in the world. In other words, the core of his account is regarding the technical application of logic, as well as the logical arrangement of *techne*. Therefore, as I have explicated in the second chapter, his position is not against the philosophical discipline of "logic". Philosophical studies of "logic" may inform us about the formal laws of reasoning, yet the kind of thinking that seeks to undergo an experience with the open-bounded site (*topos*) of being as language (*logos*), need to think beyond the confines of the technical interpretation and application of logic.

Now, let us briefly look to the abovementioned lecture course. Examining it will help us to clarify the technological application of "logic". Heidegger spells out four characteristics of logic by elucidating the most fundamental principles of Aristotelian syllogism[469]. These are assembly, analysis, regulation, and, form consideration. For the concerns of my discussion, the regulative and the formative aspects of logic stand out as the most significant ones. There are three basic principles of logic, which link up with

[468] (*On the Way to Language*, 8)
[469] Martin Heidegger, *Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language*, trans. Wanda Torres Gregory and Yvonne Unna, (Albany: SUNY press, 2005), 3.

those four functions: (1) the principle of identity as the same-selfness of the representations, (2) the principle of non-contradiction, and (3) the principle of reason as the consequential ordering of reason that constitutes the information. Heidegger argues that consequential "method" of reasoning leads to the notion of "form consideration". What logic allows us is to disregard the content of assertions, in rendering the formal consistency of its subject matter the actual meaning of being-true. "Logic looks only at the forms of the proposition […] it is the science of the forms of the fundamental structures and fundamental rules of the proposition".[470]

The calculative mode of thinking, which is the core of our technological relation to the world, takes this process of logical ordering of reason as its model, and it only functions by formulating and objectifying its subject matter. As such, it always operates in a field of symbolized representations. In terms of its relation to language, the science does not only understand "words" as "signs", but even further, it *formalizes* and *formulates* things as *formally* referable symbols. For instance, we could use the symbol A to refer to the line "Carrying the day's events, the cloud drifts along" in the poem that Ueda examined. In this way, we may symbolize the topic of the poem "as something" to which we can refer as such. Now, the topic of the poem has become an object, ready to be transported for the purposes of information and communication. In this instance, language no longer appears as the site in which we can "think" the poem itself. On the other hand, if the content of the poem still matters to us, we could never simply refer to it as "A". The reason is that each time we read the poem it may disclose a different perspective of that which it speaks. It may open up a new horizon of thought, because that which it brings to the fore via the way-making movement of language is not exhaustible.

[470] Martin Heidegger, *Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language*, trans. Wanda Torres Gregory and Yvonne Unna, (Albany: SUNY press, 2005), 4.

It is within this context that Heidegger states that science does not "think". Insofar as science reasons via the form consideration, the experience [*Er-fahrung*] of things *as* things never appears as a possibility.[471] It is obvious that Heidegger does not understand "thinking" in the sense of abstract reasoning, systematic analysis, and such. As far as Heidegger's concerns go, "thinking" signifies undergoing an experience with that which concerns us. Instead of objectifying and regulating what matters to us, we should let it transform and overwhelm us in the course of our journeying with it. However, especially for natural sciences, language appears only as a means of demonstration. We use symbols, and formulas for experimenting, calculating, and then communicating the outputs of our research. As such, language does not show up as the site in which the experience of being itself can transpire, but only as the space of "logistics" of formulas and definitions.[472] Insofar as sciences doe not discern the thing as the thing, but only as the "object" of analysis, the earth and its entities turn into "human-stuff", either in the sense of "for-human" or "of-human". In that regard, insofar as disciplines included in the "humanities" understand themselves as "sciences" and appeal to the technical application of logic as the basis of their methodologies, they end up objectifying the human being, and lose contact with precisely what defines the core of "human", namely, its relation to *logos*.

In light of the discussion on *techne* and *logos*, the essence of modern technology appears to be the following: the systemic regulation of the "way" of *logos*[473]. Within that

[471] Martin Heidegger, *What is Called Thinking*, trans. Fred D. Wieck and J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper Row, 1968), 8.

[472] While I could not undertake it in my dissertation, it would be interesting to make a comparison of Hume and Heidegger in terms of their understanding of the object (or the thing) and the responsibility of the science in that regard. While Hume thinks that things are only about the sum total of their empirical qualities and there is no thing as such beyond these qualities, for Heidegger, the sum total of the empirical qualities of a thing will never tell us what the thing is, because what makes the thing that it is, is its being, which is neither a sensuous or non-sensuous "quality". So, according to Hume what science can do at best is to examine these empirical qualities, while would give us an idea about the object. For Heidegger such vision of science is not sufficient because it is meta-physical.

[473] "But above all, technology itself prevents any experience of its nature. For while it is

context, Heidegger's main issue with the modern technology is not our use of technological devices, but the methodological "framework" [*Gestell*] that "frames" and fixes our relation and nearness to things. This, in turn, leads human beings to produce further "machination" that enclose humans in their technological relation to things. As such, human beings accept technology as the only way of relating to phenomena. In 1934, Heidegger comes to name the threat that the modern technology poses to humanity as "organized uniformity"[474]. Already as of 1933, Heidegger wrote in *On the Origin of The Work of Art* what follows:

> Ge-stell, as the essence of modern technology, comes from letting-lie-before experienced in the Greek manner, *logos*, from the Greek *poiesis* and *thesis* the putting in place of *Ge-stell*- which now means the summoning of everything into assured availability, there speaks the claim of *ratio reddenda*, i.e., of *logon didonai*.[475]

Framing the emergence of language, which is capable of disclosing the world to us, results in a new language called the "technological language". The "technological language" is the space of logistics of signs and symbols, encompassing an ongoing "transportation" of meanings, a process in which language turns into the tool of exchange of in*form*ation. In the following rich and dense passage, Heidegger explicates the tension that results from such a *form*alization of language:

> […] 'Natural language' of which one must talk in this context is posited in advance as a not-yet-formalized language that is being set up to be framed in formalization. Formalization, the calculated availability of Saying, is the goal and the norm. The 'natural' aspect of language, which the will to formalization still seems forced to concede for the time being, is not experienced and understood in the light of the originary nature of language. That nature is *physis,* which in its turn is based on the appropriation [*Ereignis*] from which Saying arises to move.

---

developing its own self to the full, it develops in the sciences a kind of knowing that is debarred from ever entering into the realm of the essential nature of technology, let alone retracing in thought that nature's origin." (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 114–115).

[474] (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 153)

[475] (*Off the Beaten Track*, 34)

> Information theory conceives of the natural aspect of language as a lack of formalization.[476]

Therefore, Heidegger's aim is to alert us to the fact that when the nature of language is framed, the words no longer beckon, but only signify and designate without any experience of the "way-making" and journeying. In such a way of showing, there is no space to be traversed between the word and the sign, and the sign is taken as the ultimate representation of the object. Let me explain with an example. Today people sometimes communicate by using "smileys" or animations on their smart phones. The images are pre-chosen, pre-designed, and framed on the phone's screen –which itself is a frame– to represent and express certain emotions and ideas. Making use of language in such a way, we way not even need "dictionary words". In order to express oneself, one can simply "attach" or "copy-paste" a generic image. With today's smartphone technology, it is easily possible to have a "conversation" without saying any words, but only exchanging the symbolic representations of "emotions". In such a use, language does not even appear as the tool of communication, but as the digitally arranged space of logistics in and through which images that represent the attached symbol of objectified feelings or emotions are transported back and forth. An extreme technization of *logos* through turns language into a platform of logistics.[477] So, the question is the following one: what is it that allows for such "framing" of the nature of language? This requires a closer examination of the "essence" of modern technology.

Just as the primary significance of language for Heidegger is not the linguistic process of signification, the essence of technology is nothing that can be technologically

[476] (*On the Way to Language*, 132)
[477] (*On the Way to Language*, 25, 32)

grasped either.[478] The key concept in that regard is "the framework" (or "*en-framing*") [das *Gestell*], which for Heidegger denotes the essence of modern technology. The "framework" [*Gestell*] is the obstruction and manipulation of the event, rendering phenomena only as stuff to be planned, organized, regulated, used and infinitely exploited.[479] It denotes the kind of comportment toward our being in the world where we make sense of phenomena only within the frames of "frameworks". Likewise, "Within Framing, speaking turns into information".[480] As such, it is the complete objectification of all phenomena. "The framework" [*Ge-stell*] leads human beings to make sense of everything only in terms of human representations [*Vor-stellung*], wills and concerns, where the "world" in which we exist turns into a representable object detached from us. Because of its capacity to fix and control the meaning of beings, the "framework" appears as the interruption of the "way-making movement" of language and the event. In other words, it conceals the very potential of un-concealment (*a-letheia*). Accordingly, Heidegger thinks that the primary danger that the essence of modern technology poses does not only consist in its moral, ecological, sociological, economical consequences, but rather in that it *gets in the way* of the way-making of the event.

In *On the Way to Language*, Heidegger suggests that the "metaphysical-technological explanation *gets everywhere in the way*, and keeps us from considering the matter proper".[481] The *technical* regulation of *logos* provides techno-logy with the

---

[478] Technology is not equivalent to the essence of technology. When we are seeking the essence of 'tree,' we have to become aware that that which pervades every tree, as tree, is not itself a tree that can be encountered among all the other trees. Likewise, the essence of technology is by no means anything technological. (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 4)

[479] Shrinking designates another significant essence of the word *Ge-stell*. Namely, when *Ge-stell* happens, our experience of time and space gets shrunk. "All distances in time and space are shrinking*"* (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 163)

[480] (*On the Way to Language*, 132)

[481] (*On the Way to Language*, 98) In the original, it reads: "weil überall das metaphysisch-technische Erklären dazwischen führt und uns aus der sachgemäßen Besinnung herausdrangt" Martin Heidegger, GA: 12 *Unterwegs Zur Sprache*, (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985), 193. (My emphasis)

"methodology" to manipulate phenomena, which brings us to a significant implication of *techne*. "Methodology", as we have seen earlier in this chapter, now comes to mean the very instrumentalization and obstruction of the "way-making" movement. This also leads to the standardization of thinking where a new way of thinking remains constantly repressed, as "one" has to think "this-way" or "that-way", but never freely traversing the *topos* of thinking as such. When all the ways of thinking are "pre-determined" by the "signs" of a calculative mode of transportation, place remains constantly enclosed, instead of being "open-bounded". Accordingly, *techne* of modern technology no longer denotes a sense of bringing forth and making manifest, but rather signifies a ceaseless process of re-fabrication in following the most effective laws of production by way of circulating the procedures of "designation" and the "de-sign" of existence. As such, "methodology" becomes the servant of technology. In effect, modern technology, in that sense, is the very manipulation of logic, thus, of *logos* as language and being. Heidegger calls the situation in which human beings find themselves a "challenge" [*herausfordern*].[482] The manipulative attitude towards *techne* and *logos*, namely, the constant exploitation of the gathering and situating of language, brings us to the notion of *Be-stand,* namely "standing-reserve"*,* which shows how language is treated as a readily manipulable object.[483] *Be-stand* should be examined in relation to language as *logos*.[484]

The essence of modern technology (*Ge-stell*) is a mode of disclosure, and what it reveals is: *Be-stand*, which means the infinite stocking of phenomena as manipulable

[482] (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 14)
[483] Martin Heidegger, "Traditional Language and Technological Language", trans. Wanda Torres Gregory, Journal of Philosophical Research, Volume XXIII (1998): 130.
[484] The overall move in Heidegger literature is to make the connection between technology and dwelling with regards to one's nearness to where one dwells. See: Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 195; Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 297. (However, if one's dwelling place is language, *Be-stand* too must be thought with regards to language.)

objects. We can translate the word as "standing-reserve" as well.[485] If we investigate the etymology of the *Bestand*, we observe that it derives from the German verb *bestehen*, which means, "to remain in force", "persist", "continue to exist". In *bestehen*, we note the verb *stehen*, which means, "to stand". I have claimed that Heidegger conceives of the modern technology as a "standing in the way". The way-making movement of saying *relates* the "words" and the "signs", also "being" and "beings", through the occurrence in the open-bounded that human beings inhabit (language). The "way" is the *way of the word* (*tao*), namely the way in which phenomena come to manifest themselves through the event. On the other hand, *Ge-stell* fixes the way that through which things can come to occur. It stops the happening of the way and thus of the place. In other words, the framework enframes the "between", the *topos* of the disclosing-gathering activity of place, and as such, the neighbouring regions are concealed and disconnected insofar as the relation remains broken off.

Being the "standing-reserve", the framework "remains in force" on the way, and it does so by transforming the nature (*physis*) into *infinitely* available raw material. The essence of modern technology functions on the basis that such a relationship with the nature can be maintained *ad infinitum*. The relation between "the framework" and the "standing-reserve" is two-way. As a manner of annihilation of all finitude, "standing-reserve" [*Be-stand*] provides the framework [*Ge-stell*] with *infinite* control of the way, while the framework provides the standing-reserve with the infinite power of "fixing in place". As a result of *Gestell*, the very counter-occurrence and the opposite of the event, humans appear only as the makers (and planners) of the earth. Where the earth itself turns into an "object", there remains no possibility for dwelling, as the "framework" obstructs

[485] It is worthwhile that Heidegger contrasts *Be-stand* with *Gegen-stand*, namely "object", implicating that when object is transformed into standing-reserve, human beings no longer have an objective distance to the products of modern technology. (*Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, 17)

the way to the site. The extreme danger in that relationship is that the fate of nature and all other beings is left to the accurateness of technological representations and projects of humans, insofar as nature is only acknowledged as a source of raw material to provide for the human beings *ad infinitum*. This is why Heidegger thinks that the technological understanding of being is "meta–*physical"*. It no longer recognizes the limits of *physis* as limits, and as such, it does not even recognize dwelling as an issue. In this very state of being disconnected from the boundaries of the nature as *physis*, where the happening of being and language occurs, one's relation to *physis* transforms itself to a relation of limitless manipulation of the earth.[486] The "framework", then, can be seen as the ultimate counter-movement of the event [*Ereignis*], in that it obstructs the happening of the way. In other words, the way that stretches between the "openness of being" and the self-manifestation of being itself gets blocked. It is in this sense that the issue of the framework is topological, as it concerns the relation between the way and place, and its obstruction. The "framework" detaches the dwelling-place of human beings from the world of dwelling (fourfold) in a way that human beings can no longer have any relation to the world beyond their own. This results in the annihilation of any possibility of dwelling, because inasmuch as dwelling means being in the open-bounded, where there are no boundaries human beings lose the experience of place and being situated in place.

Here, let me underline a significant point. Once we discover "methodologies" with which we can manipulate *techne* and *logos*, technology, as the technical *form*ulation and regulation of *logos*, can constantly re-produce its own "laws" of operation. This is so because it precisely trans-forms itself into a technology of the *form*ation of new techniques and industries, which in turn re-produces and re-inforces the very same techniques through which it functions. For instance, the "methodology" helps us discover

[486] Martin Heidegger, "Traditional Language and Technological Language", trans. Wanda Torres Gregory, Journal of Philosophical Research, Volume XXIII (1998): 137.

the laws of computation via the technical manipulation of *logos*, applying these logical rules in the process of making machines that can fabricate computers. In turn, we use those very computers in order to write books where we criticize the ways in which the laws of computation determine our ways of thinking: human beings remain "stuck" in a technological way of being.[487] This means that if the essence of modern technology is to prevail, it must do so by establishing a self-enclosed system that constantly maintains the obstruction of the possibility of a different relation to technology. In other words, the "framework" prevails because in "enframing" it leaves no space for an opening. The "framework" is the constant technical interpretation and application of things, not only prevalent in the production of technical devices, but in our ways of being, thinking, and saying.

Heidegger expresses his concerns as follow: what if "calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced *as the only* way of thinking"?[488] The question does not ask whether we should continue using technological devices or not. Doing so would not only be attempting to go against the natural course of the history, but we would also completely submit to the reigning power of the "framework". This means that Heidegger's thought aims to offer a new relation, a way of "resistance" –whose nature I shall explicate in brief– in and through which we can resist the technological understanding and experience of being, while avoiding a techno-logical solution to the question of the framework. The kind of resistance that is at issue does not imply defiance or rejection, but on the contrary, it implicates the necessity to encounter what threatens us. Human beings cannot "transform" the way in which modern technology claims them, because its essence is not anything that human beings –individually or collectively– make

[487] "Whether he as an individual knows it or not, wills it or not, self-asserting man is a functionary of technology" (*Off the Beaten Track*, 220).
[488] Martin Heidegger, *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. John. M, Anderson and E. Hand Freund (New York: Harper & Row, 1996), 56. (From here on: *Discourse on Thinking*)

or produce.[489] We can ask whether this is a justifiable claim. To what extent can philosophy help us in confronting the essence of modern technology? In that regard, there are several important points that need to be fleshed out to explain why rejecting or defying modern technology would also be a technological approach.

A "methodological" "account" that seeks to "overcome" the essence of modern technology reinforces its very essence as the "framework". We calculate how to "overcome" the modern technology and submit ourselves to a technological framework in which we try to "regulate", "arrange", and "fix" our understanding of it. Yet, we cannot have a pre-defined "formula" against the "framework". Hermeneutically, we cannot see our way out of modern technology, for we are defined by the historical horizon of understanding in which we are situated. The ways in which we may attempt to overcome the essence of modern technology should not be of a calculative mode of thinking, "reckoning" in terms of another "means-ends" scheme. In that sense, the obstructive counter-spacing that the essence of modern technology causes is the opposite of movement that takes place in the happening of the "hermeneutic circle", which was also central for the "situating-discussion". In that context, Heidegger offers a two-way solution:

> Still we can act otherwise. We can use technical devices, and yet with proper use also keep ourselves so free of them, that we may let go of them any time. We can use technical devices as they ought to be used, and also let them alone as something which does not affect our inner and real core. We can affirm the unavoidable use of technical devices, and also deny them the right to dominate us, and so to warp, confuse, and lay waste our nature. [490]

[489] "No single man, no group of men, no commission of prominent statesmen, scientists, and technicians, no conference of leaders of commerce and industry, can brake or direct the progress of history in the atomic age. No merely human organization is capable of gaining dominion over it." (*Discourse on Thinking*, 52)
[490] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 52)

This means that while we say "yes" to using technological devices, we must also say "no" to the essence of modern technology. Heidegger's suggestion indicates a circular, "hermeneutic" response to the issue at hand, in the sense of "situating" ourselves in the back and forth movement of thinking, neither being completely determined by "yes" or "no". In other words, if we are to find a space in which we can act "against", that is, in "facing" the framework, this should emerge from the between of "yes" and "no". Let us consider the feasibility of Heidegger's suggestion with an example, which could also reveal the current technological situation of human beings.

Heidegger's mutual "yes" and "no" cannot be separated from technological devices that we use in our everyday lives. For instance, a smartphone with Internet connection is no longer only a phone, and in what ways the smartphone is to be used is not evident. Similarly, social media networks, games and apps that one is encouraged to use on the smartphone are capable of transforming the nature of "utility" and "necessity". One can nowadays use the smartphone as a mini-computer while never making any phone calls. Another point is that the smartphone requires constant dependency to energy resources that one implicitly or explicitly treats as infinite reserve ready to be exploited. In addition, one must maintain continuous awareness of the device's battery, the recent updates of the applications downloaded on the smartphone, regardless of the fact of whether one actually needs to use the device or not. As such, the smartphone imposes itself on the individual as an object that needs to be used always. Once one decides to leave the device to itself, it quickly becomes unusable. The smartphone with Internet connection, in that regard, is not the same tool as the sewing machine. In using the latter, one has a very clear purpose: sewing. Its "machine-ness" never becomes an issue, because it is designed to serve to a very specific end. On the other hand, once one starts using smartphones to the extent of taking advantage of all its offerings, one finds oneself

entangled in a system that entirely designs how one must live. In order to read e-mails and respond to them, the researcher has to have or find a Wi-Fi connection, a power outlet to charge the battery of the phone or the laptop. It is very much possible to think that one day, we will be ultimately surrounded by such devices, applications and systems such that saying "yes" to using them will imply that saying the simultaneous "no" that Heidegger mentions will not be possible. Using the products of modern technology may one day mean that we submit to the way in which it can transform us, and therefore let it define the essence of human being. This is why, the double "yes" and "no" that is at issue remains to be a challenging one. The essence of modern technology advances in a direction where the between of the "yes" and "no" appears to shrink along with space and time.

Now, the key idea is the following: the saving of human beings' essence is not something that human beings can make or produce. Heidegger admits the fact that he has no readymade solutions to the issue.[491] What Heidegger attempts to do is to prepare our readiness for a change in our relation to things in the future. The double and simultaneous "yes" and "no" that Heidegger spells out does not intend to find an immediate solution, but allows us to find the way to the openness where we can prepare the readiness to confront the situation in which we find ourselves. Therefore, it aims to raise our awareness to the fact that we must remain on the way of thinking, in order to discover a "bypath" by which we can find the "way". It is within that context that we should understand Heidegger. As such, saying merely "yes" would be surrendering to the framework, while saying "no" would mean wiling against it and submitting to the technological framing. Insofar as what is at stake is "the saving of man's essential nature, the relation between the

[491] "SPIEGEL: You do not count yourself among those who, if they would only be heard, could point out a path?

HEIDEGGER: No! I know of no path toward a direct change of the present state of the world, assuming that such a change is at all humanly possible. But it seems to me that the attempted thinking could awaken, clarify, and fortify the readiness we have already mentioned." *Der Spiegel* (31 May 1976): 206.

way, place and their connection must be preserved. Therefore, the issue is keeping meditative thinking alive". [492] Heidegger's answer in terms of the "preservation [*Verwahrung*] of what's original"[493] is "releasement", or "letting-be", [*Gelassenheit*] which is a manner of both confronting, but at the same time remaining in a relation with that which challenges us. Thinking is not attempting to provide a solution, but accepting the challenge and trying to respond to it. In that vein of thinking, I will discuss this issue of "letting-be" in the next and closing section of the chapter.

III. 7 Releasement into the Region: *Gelassenhei*t as Letting-Be

In the last section, I have explicated the contrast between the framework and the way-making movement of language as the event. This required me to clarify Heidegger's final ideas regarding the critique of modern technology. Consequently, in this section I will focus on examining Heidegger's topological idea of the way and place of resistance "against" the framework, which needs to be understood on the basis of the question of dwelling as "in-dwelling" [*In-ständigkeit*][494]. However, "in-dwelling" makes sense if and only if we understand what is at work with the following key notions: "the region" and "releasement" or "letting-be".

My line of thinking in this section is as follows: 1) the "releasement" (or letting-

[492] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 56)
[493] Martin Heidegger, "Traditional Language and Technological Language", trans. Wanda Torres Gregory, Journal of Philosophical Research, Volume XXIII, (1998): 142.
[494] Other translations of the German word "*Inständigkeit*" are "steadfast insistence" (McNeill and Powell) and "steadfastness" (Rojcewicz and Vallega-Neu). There are two reasons as to why I prefer to follow Bret Davis, Anderson and Freund's translation as "in-dwelling": First, the term "in-dwelling" helps to underline the topological essence of the necessity to resist the "framework". What is at issue is precisely a "remaining" in the open region, that is, in the dwelling place disclosed by the "releasement". Second, "steadfast insistence" risks sounding like a subjectivistic will on the part of human being. What situates the human being in the "region" is not one's individual resolution, but the capacity to attune oneself to the happening of place itself, which is dwelling. Thus "in-dwelling" can also resonate with that non-subjectivistic and non-human aspect of the issue.

be) [*Gelassenheit*][495] is the way in which the essence of human beings is *released* in(to) thinking through "non-willing". Heidegger puts forward the idea of "non-willing" [*Nicht-Wollen*] as our "released" mode of meditative (mindful) thinking [*besinnliches Denken*], as a way of resisting the dominating effects of the framework. 2) The openness of being in which the essence of the human beings can dwell is the region [*die Gegnet*]. "Letting-be" or "releasement" [*Gelassenheit*] as a mode of being and thinking *releases* the human being into the openness of the "region". 3) The way of dwelling in "re-sisting" the framework is "in-dwelling", or "steadfast insistence". It signifies the kind of dwelling that is required against the "framework" where human beings can attempt to maintain their access to the "way-making" of language.

The notion of the "region" [*Gegnet*] has a significant role in Heidegger's topologically oriented thought in the late 1950s and 1960s. The word is specific to the southern German dialects. In Heidegger's thought, the "region" indicates the open site in which human beings may stand in a free relation to the essence of modern technology. "Free" here does not mean "independent" from or "indifferent" to it. On the contrary, it admits the necessity of a "confrontation", which means a face-to-face situatedness in encountering what is at issue. The site of this relation is the "region"[496], which can be

[495] Bret Davis discusses several possible translations in English for the notion of *Gelassenheit*. Accordingly, Davis submits that "releasement" does not do justice to the nuances of the German, while "letting-be" which preserves the "lassen" in *Gelassenheit*, risks giving a sense of mere "allowance" or "letting go". However, Davis remarks, Heidegger's emphasis is also on the sense of "getting into, engaging with, getting involved with things" [*Sicheinlassen auf*] as "actively letting beings be themselves". Thus, *Gelassenheit* is "engaged releasement". In that regard, Davis emphasizes the double sense, namely the "positive" and "negative", "yes" and "no" that is required in our relation to the framework. Bret Davis, *Heidegger and the Will*: *On the Way to Gelassenheit*. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007), xxv-xxvii.

[496] In Turkish, there is a word whose etymology is interesting in that regard. The word "verimli arazi", which is often used in the agricultural contexts, could be translated as "fertile land". However, etymologically, the word "verimli" literally says "self-giving", deriving from the verb "to give" (ver-). When this is thought in relation to Heidegger's constant emphasis on the German expression "*Es gibt*", (it gives) in terms of the overflowing nature of being, I find that "the region" could be precisely thought as that "fertile and giving place". As I understand it, "the region" is the site of tranquil creativity on the part of human beings where they are disturbed as little as possible

thought as the tranquil *topos* of thinking and, as Davis underlines, the place of non-passive "waiting" [*warten*] and not "awaiting" [*erwarten*][497], protected from the obstructing essence of the framework. The "region", as the open place that lets beings be, both saves the way(s) of language as way(s) and safeguards them against the framing of the framework. The site in which human beings protect the essence of their existence is the region. The "way" of dwelling in the "region" is "in-dwelling", which brings us to the notion of the "releasement" as "letting-be".

It is significant to mark that the discourse on "letting-be" and "the region" takes place in a conversation of three interlocutors, the "teacher", the "scientist" and the "scholar". In the text, Heidegger uses the same topological approach of "situating-discussion" that took place between him and Tezuka. This can awaken us to the fact that Heidegger resists putting forward a readymade account of "letting-be", but rather attempts to let the idea come to the fore following its own course. Now, Heidegger calls the appropriate attitude towards modern technology (and the technological mode of reflection) "letting-be" [*Gelassenheit*]. The term has a rich background, having been employed in various ways in the religious and philosophical history of German culture before Heidegger. In effect, Heidegger borrows the term from the German mystic thinker Eckhart, but uses it in a new context.[498] Caputo explains the etymology of the word as

---

by the essence of modern technology and where they find the possibility of a tranquil dwelling on the earth as mortals.

[497] Bret Davis, *Heidegger and the Will*: *On the Way to Gelassenheit*. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007), 221.

[498] Caputo's explanation of the mystical background of the term is highly worthwhile. As he puts it, "letting-be" originally means:

"The 'openness'' of the soul, on the other hand, consists in what Scheffler, following a long tradition in German mystical literature, calls 'releasement' (Gelassenheit), i.e., an unselfish surrender to God's will." John D. Caputo, *The Mystical Element in Heidegger's Thinking* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1986), 99.

follows: "The root of this word, *lassen*, means to let go, to relinquish, to abandon [...] But '*lassen*' also means to 'let' or 'permit,' and so it suggests openness and receptivity."[499]

Heidegger's use of the notion of "letting-be" is related to his understanding of "willing" and "non-willing"[500]. In Heidegger's thought, the true opposite of "willing" is not "willing-against" or "indifference". The "non-willing" that Heidegger's thought aims to elaborate is the kind of comportment which leaves [*einlasst*] "will" alone to itself. In a sense, Heidegger seeks to emphasize a sense of "acting", which Bret Davis names "engaged waiting" which does not emerge from willing[501] and avoids re-presenting [*vor-stellen*] the world according to one's own egoistic needs and desires. We should not consider the thing only as the object [*Gegen-stand*], as that which stands over and against us, but as *Dinge,* as that which gathers human being and being in the world. Therefore, the mode of thinking that does not represent things as mere objects is "non-willing". "Non-willing means, therefore: willingly to renounce willing."[502] In the dialogue, it is mentioned that the way in which the term "releasement" is employed is not the same as Eckhart used it in the sense of "casting off selfishness and letting self-will go".[503] It is evident that Heidegger aims to give an onto-ethical account of willing that does not derive from the "ego", but from one's situatedness on the earth. This point especially makes sense when

---

[499] John D. Caputo, *The Mystical Element in Heidegger's Thinking*, 119.

[500] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 79-80)
It could be argued that Heidegger views the history of metaphysics as the history of "willing" which is uttered as "will to power" in Nietzsche's philosophy. Nietzsche's "will for power" is the meaning of being(s), and therefore that which devalues "life" must be overcome. However, overcoming does not mean incorporating, but rather "reversing". In reversing the same methodological structure, Nietzsche's thought does not suggest an alternative to the history of metaphysics, but only devalues it.

[501] "Scientist: You speak without letup of a letting-be and give the impression that what is meant is a kind of passivity. All the same, I think I understand that it is in no way a matter of weakly allowing things to slide and drift along.

Scholar: Perhaps a higher acting is concealed in releasement than is found in all the actions within the world and in the machinations of all mankind." (*Discourse on Thinking*, 61)

[502] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 59)

[503] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 62)

considered within the context of Heidegger's confrontation with Nietzsche. Unlike Schopenhauer, Nietzsche thought that in human behaviour, the driving force is not a mere "will to live" (which is how Nietzsche reads Schopenhauer), but a sense of pleasure from expanding one's power. The notion of creative willing played an important role in Nietzsche's thought. For instance, in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche said: "Yes, this ego and the ego's contradiction and confusion still speak most honestly about its being; this creating, willing, valuing *ego* which is the measure and value of things"[504] This willing and creating ego refuses to be attached values externally imposed from an "other" realm. It is interesting to read Heidegger in that context, as his aim is not to develop a notion of "willing" that is "before" or "beyond" the *ego*, but rather he seeks to find out about that which "situates" the *ego* in place. Only this can make "willing" meaningful and grant human beings their humanness. Such a mode of comporting oneself in the world means "non-willing", as the openness to be appropriated and conditioned in and by place, and this is why it is related to the issue of dwelling.

Heidegger calls the mode of being in and through which we can resist "the framework" by way of non-willing is "in-dwelling" [*In-ständigkeit*]. This could be simply understood as a mode of meditative "waiting" in order to withstand the advance of the domination of the framework without willing *for* or *against* it. As a result of "in-dwelling", one awaits by facing toward the future as to that which is to come [*Zu-kunft*, *a-venir* (in Turkish, *gelecek*, literally "that-which–will-come")]. One of the key concepts to be considered in order to understand "in-dwelling" is the ancient Greek *kairos*[505], as

[504] Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, ed. Adrian Del Naro, trans. Robert B. Pippin (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 21)

[505] McNeill deliberately brings into view the relationship between *logos* and *kairos* by Heidegger's early interpretations of Aristotle. At first, *kairos*, as the "opportune moment of action" appears to be through and through "political" insofar as human actions have their place in a common world, which, in Heidegger's thought is designates as "being-in-the-world" as "being-with". However, it is precisely one's capacity to not only act in accordance with the norm that bestows the particular significance to *kairos* and the topological essence of the issue is precisely what follows: One has

thinking the background of the notion can provide us with insights intp our situation with regards to the advance of modern technology. In the Christian tradition, the term means the "opportune moment" in attending one's relation with God. Before Christianity, the term has been central to Sophists in relation to one's capacity to adapt to the changing conditions of life and act accordingly. wqIt also indicates the right time and the right place to bring in the right judgment in rhetoric. Although the word *kairos* first strikes us as a temporal term in these religious and rhetoric contexts, its essence must be considered from a topological point of view.

In Heidegger's thought, the term *kairos* can be considered in relation to Aristotle's understanding of circumspective-practical wisdom, *phronesis*. Schalow defines *phronesis* as "the moment of insight that ends the deliberation about what the right action is toward the right person in this situation, the basis of balanced judgment."[506] In that regard, *kairos* indicates this very appropriate situatedness in the moment that is a result of genuine readiness. In other words, in the occurrence of quantitatively calculable time [*kronos*], *kairos* is the qualitative "instant" [*Augenblick*], or the "moment" that within which one is timely situated in good place for receiving the manifestation of being. The poet's saying of the word as well as the word's own appearance in language emerging from its silent grounds both indicate this primordial and all-gathering "moment" [*Nun*]. In the context of one's relation to the essence of modern technology, non-willing is closely tied to Heidegger's simultaneous "yes" and "no". As such, "in-dwelling" designates the situation

---

to stand in a free relation to the openness of one's being in order to be able to perform a particular action in the particular time that it is "appropriate", which, cannot be a technically guided action. This would be against the required openness in relation to one's situation. McNeill, William. *The Time of Life*: *Heidegger and Ethos*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006, 80-83. Also, considering McNeill's explorations of early Heidegger's interpretation of Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*, one can defend the argument that his later notion of *Gelassenheit* already had its roots in the hermeneutic discussions of *kairos* and *phronesis*, especially in relation to the notion of *Augenblick*. See: McNeill, William. *Glance of the Eye: Heidegger, Aristotle, and the Ends of Theory*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.

[506] Frank Schalow and Alfred Denker, *A Historical Dictionary of Heidegger's Philosophy* (Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2010), 8)

in which one's judgments and actions are appropriately situated in the journeying of the "moment". The chief idea is that one should neither be "for" nor "against" the modern technology. Such *phronetic* attitude in the face of modern technology is "non-willing", that is, the kind of willing that does not emerge from one's egoistic desires, but as a way of comporting oneself toward the "future", by means situating one's being in the openness of the journeying of time.

One of the biggest dangers of the attempt in confronting the essence of modern technology is to fall back into a sense of nostalgia for old techniques and technologies. The notion with which Heidegger attempts to resist that temptation is "in-dwelling" which does not signify a fatalist withdrawal from the world, just as it is not a persistent mode of willing seduced by the immediate transformation of things. It is that from which the "spatiotemporal" *between* emerges, where one can have a sense of direction and orientation in one's "care" for the world, in facing and encountering both the past and the future in the "present". It is a way of "being-with" and "moving-with" the time-play of being, and a way to place oneself in the presencing of the now [*Nun*] as the "moment". This all-encompassing "now" is the situation where one admits both the "having passed" of the past and the "has yet to arrive" of the future, a simultaneous act of accepting the disclosure and the closure of being, as a way of keeping one's being open to the self-opening of the event. Indeed, such a manner of situating oneself in the moment, and *letting* things be what they have been, are, and may be in the future, is the meaning of non-willing as acceptance of the being-there of human existence as a "destiny". In other words, it is an acknowledgment of human beings' temporal "thrownness" into the event. Davis writes in connection with "in-dwelling": "Along with *Innestehen*, this word (*Inständigkeit*) reflects Heidegger's turn from understanding the "ek-sistence" of Dasein in any "transcendental" sense (i.e., as overstepping beings to posit a horizon) to that of a

standing-out-within the clearing […]"[507]. Dwelling *in* the open requires "in-dwelling" in the sense that it is a dwelling *on*, a steadfast in-sistence, and thus, an engaged, yet a non-reactionary "re-sistence".

The idea of "in-dwelling" and its *kairotic* and *phronetic* essence can also be thought in relation to the Chinese concept "*Wu-wei*" in the sense of "non-doing", or "doing without force". Given the fact that Heidegger endeavoured to co-translate Lao-Tze's *Tao Te Ching* in the 1950s with Hsiao, a project that was left incomplete, it is very possible to think that he was particularly familiarity with the notion.[508] For the most part, the idea of "non-willing" and "non-doing" is traditionally foreign to the Greek and Judeo-Christian thought, where the primary way of dealing with things is "*praxis*". One, as the subject, is the master of things [*pragmata*], which are objects. In the age of modern technology, this gets translated into the ultimate maximization of utility by imposing human power upon the earth. Now, for Heidegger, "willing for willing" is the very characteristic of the essence of modern technology, which, again, is an idea that is central to his critique of Nietzsche.[509] Heidegger's meditative thinking requires a dynamic manner of waiting in the moment, which suggests that there is a harmony between movement and rest. From a topological standpoint, as May also argues, it should also be noted that one "waits" for *no-thing* else but the openness itself, which is not a phenomenon. Indeed, in the word "*wu-wei*" there is the *wu*, which means "nothingness" or "emptiness" in

[507] Bret Davis, *Heidegger and the Will*: *On the Way to Gelassenheit*. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007), 222.
[508] Hwa Yol Jung also mentions this idea when he writes: "Here Heidegger's notion of serenity or releasement parallels the Taoist idea of *wu wei* and the Zen way of thinking and doing–the way of refraining from thinking and doing contrary to the natural and spontaneous way of thinking." Hwa Yol Jung, "Heidegger's Way With Sinitic Thinking", in *Heidegger and Asian Thinking*, ed. Graham Parkes (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 233.
[509] Martin Heidegger, *Nietzsche.* vol I-II, trans. David Farell Krell (New York: Harper One, 1991), 127.

Chinese.[510] The "non-doing" and "in-dwelling" indicate one's willingness for non-willing in order to attain the openness by waiting for no particular "out-come". The future [*Zu-kunft*] as that which is to come must be allowed to move in its natural way of journeying. The notions of *kairos*, *phronesis* and *wu-wei* appear as similar modes of comporting oneself beyond calculative thinking, which help us in better understanding what is at issue with "in-dwelling". In "letting-be" we have both being and doing, embodied in a tranquil way. The kind of "waiting" in the "in-dwelling" takes us to the key topological essence of the issue.

The notion of "waiting" that is at matter here does not have a predefined "goal", and it is neither simply teleological nor pragmatic. One does not wait for "something" "pre-defined" to arrive and transform us (and our relation to the framework). One waits by remaining receptive to the "journeying of place" and releases us to the site of "letting-be":

> *Teacher:* Because waiting releases itself into openness ...
> *Scholar:* ... into the expanse of distance …
> *Teacher:* . . . in whose nearness it finds the abiding in which it remains.[511]

Here, "waiting" is parallel to the "way-making" that brings "in-dwelling" to the "dwelling-place" as the openness [*Offenheit*], which itself is not a goal to be achieved. It is not something to be "reached" after some time or after we change our position in space. The openness is the nature of the "region" and as such, it is not something we can create or produce. In that sense, in order to be able to attain the openness of the region, we must also open ourselves toward it by way of "letting-be" (releasement). As such, the relation is two-way and mutual. "The region that regions" [*die Gegnet*] is the open site where the self-opening of being itself meets the openness of the clearing, as the *there* of being as

[510] (*On the Way to Language*, 18) Reinhard May, *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work*, trans. Graham Parkes (London & New York: Routledge, 1996), 31, 51.
[511] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 68)

Da-sein, where two *topoi* envelop into one another. The mutual happening of place that is at issue is the act of "regioning", which is the convergence of two distinct modes of "openness". This is the meaning of "correspondence" [*Ent-sprechen*] that takes place in the open site of the event between human being and being.

Davis explains the correspondence between being and human being by spelling out three significations, and what one might say, three moments in the "overcoming" of willing for willing[512]: "1) not-willing, 2) deferred-willing, 3) proper-willing." This translates into: "1) Willing not to will, 2) waiting in radical passivity for the arrival of an other beginning, 3) a non-willing corresponsive participation in the appropriating event of *beyng*." The region is the place of the correspondence, which is also the place of the non-willing. In that regard, we can interpret language as the "region" within which the third stage of "non-willing", which Davis calls the "proper willing", can take place. Now, although Davis astutely acknowledges Heidegger's topological way of thinking "unconcealment" (*aletheia*) as the "clearing"[513] and he highlights the ways in which Heidegger comes to bring into view the "region" as the site of non-willing and indwelling, he surprisingly provides no explication as to the place-related nature of "region" as such. What does the "region that regions" specifically amount to considered in topological terms? Where and how do we find the "open-region" that is being mentioned?

First, let me explain the reason why Heidegger does not choose to employ the commonplace word signifying "region", namely "*das Gegend*", but "that which regions" [*die Gegnet*]: 1) Heidegger aims to emphasize the happening of the region, and not the conception of region as a spatially enclosed domain or realm, 2) he wants to underscore the sense of "non-doing" that is at issue. The openness is *no-thing* that can be achieved by

[512] Bret Davis, *Heidegger and the Will*: *On the Way to Gelassenheit*. (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007), 226.
[513] Bret Davis, *Heidegger and the Will*: *On the Way to Gelassenheit*, 40, 198, 230.

human planning, organizing, producing. It belongs to the essence of the happening of the place and in that particular sense, of the nature itself as *physis*. It is the region itself that "lets-in" [*einlasst*] the human being, and as such, it not an opening arranged or opened up by human beings.[514]

> Teacher: It strikes me as something like a region, an enchanted region where everything belonging there returns to that in which it rests.
>
> Scholar: I'm not sure I understand what you say now.
>
> Teacher: I don't understand it either, if by "understanding" you mean the capacity to re-present what is put before us as if sheltered amid the familiar and so secured, for I, too, lack the familiar in which to place what I tried to say about openness as a region.[515]

The teacher insists on the fact that this is not just any region, but is *the* region, namely the region of all regions. This should remind us of the other topological sites and topological occurrences that Heidegger mentioned in his thinking: the *there* [*Da*], way [*Weg*], dwelling-place [*ethos*], place [*Stätte*, *Ort*, *Ortschaft*], the way-making movement [*be-wëgung*], the event [*Ereignis*], all of which implicate various instances of the situatedness of human existence in place, rendering language as "the between" [*das Zwischen*] and the relation of human beings and being. Now, Heidegger comes to argue that the region, as "that-which-regions" [*die Gegnet*], is the most sheltering region of all. This is because it "non-wills" against the framework, which is the most extreme objectification of the earth and the biggest obstacle for dwelling. This means, "region that regions" is the site in which the openness of human being and self-opening/unfolding of being can *correspond* [*entsprechen*] to one another, which is the shelter of human beings that in which they may engage in the resistant "waiting" as "proper willing". In the "region", "everything returns

[514] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 62)
[515] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 65)

to itself". The essence of the region is "open expanse", and the essence of "regioning" is "gathering and re-sheltering for an expanded resting and abiding."[516] Within that context, it is peculiar that the scientist says that "he cannot quite re-present at all what abiding, sheltering and gathering" means.[517] The teacher admits the fact that perhaps we cannot accurately "de-fine" it, because what is discussed as "the region" may not have a re-presentable image. It is the place of *no-thing*. This definition of the nature of place immediately brings us to the issue of the nature of language.

We experience the openness that the region provides in and *as* language where the situatedness of human existence in the open-bounded manifests itself. This, however, takes us back to the way-making movement of language. Because, the openness that we reach in thinking is the "releasement" that we find following the ways of language:

> Teacher: Above all when the occasion is as inconspicuous as the silent course of a conversation that moves us.
>
> Scholar: But that means, the conversation brings us to that path which seems nothing else than releasement itself...
>
> Teacher: ... which is something like rest.
>
> Scholar: At this point, how movement comes from rest and remains let into rest suddenly becomes clearer to me.
>
> Teacher: Then releasement would be not only a path but a movement.
>
> Scholar: Where does this strange path go? Where does the movement proper to it rest?
>
> Teacher: Where else but in that-which-regions.[518]

In this passage, it is evident that Heidegger ponders the way-making movement of language by considering the relation between the "movement" [*Bewegung*], "way-

[516] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 66)
[517] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 67)
[518] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 70)

making" [*Be-wëgung*] and the way [*Weg*]. Dwelling, then, means remaining on the path of thinking, and first and foremost attempting to undergo an experience with language in the region that is protected by "in-dwelling". The task of thinking is to dwell in that very mode of "in-dwelling". The "releasement" releases the human being into the openness of the region [*die Gegnet*]. Heidegger stresses the significance of that by saying: "If, in accordance with Greek' story, and thought, we are aware of the nature of truth as a dis-closure and recovery; then that-which-regions, we are reminded, is presumably the hidden coming forth of this nature."[519] This means that the showing that is at issue in the act of making-manifest through saying is fundamentally the "releasement" and the "letting-be", which transpires from and toward the event. It is the act of "receiving" and "responding" to its "self-giving", which also involves the two-way manner of that very movement.

Let me recapitulate my line of thinking on the issue: it is possible to read Heidegger's simultaneous "yes" and "no" indicative of the "between" which discloses different modes of dwelling in the age of modern technology. Saying merely "yes" leads to the calculating-metaphysical mode of being that enframes, manipulates, and regulates the earth endlessly. Saying merely "no" leads to pessimism and nostalgia that submits to empowering of the framework. The double "yes " and "no", however orients itself in the moment of that which constantly "comes" (future) and that which constantly "passes" (past). As such, it places us in the openness of "now" [*Nun*], which is also the "moment" of the event of the words. The "region" is the site of that "moment" that swings in "the between". The openness that the releasement provides is the "bypath" that Heidegger mentions in confronting the framework and attempting to arrive at the "track" that leads to the "track" of the holy. This is possible only by accepting the challenge that the modern technology poses by "non-willing", instead of disregarding and attempting to over-power

[519] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 81)

it. On the contrary, instead of fighting one's *way* through the *obstruction* that the modern technology brings out, which would be "willing-against" it, Heidegger wishes to "con-front" the technological ways of thinking. A new way of thinking can only follow from the epoch of being in which we already are, being situated in "the between", the moment where both the past and the future can appear in the same horizon. The *topos* of such "en-*countering*", where our own openness meets with the self-opening of being, is what Heidegger calls the regioning, "the region of all regions" [*die Gegnet, die Gegend aller Gegenden*][520]. As such, "in-dwelling" is the *way* and medium of dwelling. Undergoing an experience with language via thinking and vice versa, then, is the true sense of "situating-discussion", which can help us in "en-countering" and "con-fronting" the framework.

[520] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 35)

IV. Early Heidegger, Language and Dwelling

Thus far I have examined and discussed the relationship between language and dwelling in Heidegger's later thought between the mid-1930s and the 1960s. His ideas suggest a place-oriented and "onto-ethical" account of dwelling within and of language. Heidegger makes an issue of the "relation" in which one stands to language rather than merely putting forward a "philosophy of language" that objectifies language. Heidegger's later thought attempts to place us in the nearness of the happening of language so that we can have a better sense of what it means to be the kind of beings that have language. Developing the mindfulness to undergo an experience with language is the meaning of dwelling in language, which is the most fundamental "action" in which human existence can partake.

At this point I would like to address the following question: what are the main differences and similarities between Heidegger's later and earlier thought on the issue of "dwelling in language"? Looking into this matter can provide us with a better perspective to understand his early and late explorations. Heidegger's early thought can be easily distinguished from his late thought in terms of its terminology, concentrations, and "methods" of thinking. Nevertheless, this should not imply that his early and later periods of thought imply two completely unconnected projects. It is rather that Heidegger's later works that more appropriately orients his earlier writings. In light of these considerations, in what follows I aim to find the ground of comparison between the early and late Heidegger on the link between language and dwelling. I will try to find the traces of later Heidegger within the limits of Heidegger's early thought, while also juxtaposing them, pointing out the contrasts. To that end, I will specifically focus on *Being and Time*

(1927)[521], which is his most comprehensive work from the 1920s on the issue. However, I will also look into his other lecture courses from the early and mid-1920s, such as *Plato's Sophist,* in order to point out the historical development of his ideas.

In Heidegger's discussions on language and dwelling in *Being and Time*, the relation between "discourse" [*Rede*] and "world" [*Welt*] is the most significant focus, though its place-related underpinnings remain obscure. This is because Heidegger does not discuss the issue of discourse by first problematizing the "relation" in which Dasein stands to language. As I will explain in detail, for Heidegger, "discourse" is the ontological expression of one's "understanding" of the everyday world. In "idle-talk" [*Gerede*], the world gets disclosed only via the average understanding and interpretation of it, where "discourse" fails to move beyond the limits of "mindless absorption". In that framework, I set out to take issue with Dreyfus's idea of "mindless absorption" to point out the idea that if human existence is to become authentic, a merely absorption in one's practical doings does not imply a comprehensive notion of dwelling. Discussing Dreyfus' position on the idea helps me to illuminate the significance of the fourfold as the later conception of dwelling.

There are certain hints of Heidegger's later topology of language in *Being and Time*, which I bring to the fore by investigating the "groundless ground" of language as "silence". I suggest that Heidegger's explorations with regards to the "call of conscience" constitutes the basis of his more encompassing ideas related to the issue of standing in a poetic relation to language. This also provides us with better-founded insights concerning the nature of language in comparison with his explicit discussions of "discourse".

[521] Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1985. (The English translation uses the seventh edition of *Sein und Zeit*. From here on: *Being and Time*)

In the first section, I thematize the relationship between "discourse" and the "world", because "discourse" appears as the ontological expression of Dasein's "being-in-the-world" [*In-der-Welt-sein*]. In the second section, I examine the relationship between "existential spatiality" and place, especially engaging with Dreyfus' commentary on the notion of "being-in-the-world", where I critique his idea of "mindless absorption". In relation to that, I highlight the relevant aspects of the Dreyfus-McDowell debate in order to explicate the significance of the "mindful" attitude towards things. This allows me to open up a topological discussion of the meaning of standing in an authentic and inauthentic relation to discourse, the world and language. In the third section, I discuss Dasein's inauthentic relation to "discourse" and the world by looking to the notion of "idle-talk" [*Gerede*]. In the fourth section, I focus on "keeping silent" [*schweigen*], which makes possible "saying" [*sagen*] as the primordial ground of human Dasein's authentic relationship to discourse. As such, in the third and fourth sections, I comparatively illustrate the relationship between "idle talk" and "silence" from a topological point of view, in specific with regards to the ideas of "ground" [*Grund*], "abyss" [*Ab-grund*] and "groundlessness" [*Bodenlosigkeit*]. In the fifth section, I examine the notion of ground in terms of the relation between silence and discourse. In doing so, I focus on the parallel between 1) being and nothingness, and 2) groundlessness, abyss and ground. In the sixth and final section, I conclude my discussion by engaging with Braver's idea of "groundless grounds", fleshing out the differences between "being-in-the-world" and the "fourfold" where two different contexts and modes of dwelling come to the fore. I take the latter as the more complete form of dwelling because, first, it does not take the human practices as the departure point in thinking the meaning of being situated, and second, thanks to the notion of "fourfold", we can actually see the immediate relationship between the event

[*Ereignis*], language, and place, where the question of language precisely appears as the question of dwelling.

IV. 1 Discourse and the World

Although language is not one of the central focuses in *Being and Time*, it becomes an issue in the fifth chapter of the first division with regards to the "being-in" of Dasein and its existential structure. The issue is the explication of the existential structure of Dasein as "understanding" [*Verstand*] and the understanding of the world that belongs to Dasein, that which *from* which discourse [*Rede*] emerges as the ontological disclosure of the world. The link at issue is apophantic because "discourse" as *logos* is about "making manifest what one is talking about".[522] In other words, it is the act of uttering an understanding and interpretation of the world. As a result of his phenomenological approach, Heidegger examines the phenomena in their ordinary appearances. This is why, instead of starting with a general conception of language, Heidegger first traces back the ordinary manifestation of language in the factual world as discourse [*Rede*]. This is indeed closely tied to the question of "communication" [*Mitteilung*], which is largely overlooked in Heidegger scholarship[523]. Heidegger suggests:

> Attempts to grasp the 'essence of language' have always taken their orientation from […] ideas of expression or of 'symbolic form', of communication as 'assertion', of the 'making-known' of experiences, of the 'patterning' of life. Even if one 'were to put these various fragmentary definitions together in syncretistic fashion, nothing would be achieved in the way of fully adequate definition of 'language.'[524]

[522] (*Being and Time*, 56)
[523] Jeffrey Powell L. "Heidegger and Communicative World". Research In Phenomenology, 40 (2010): 55.
[524] (*Being and Time*, 206)

Here, we see that Heidegger does not intend to downplay the significance of "discourse" and the topic of communication, but rather he draws our attention to the ways in which they must be re-examined on new grounds. He implicates that if we closely scrutinize our commonplace paradigms of understanding language, we can also have a better understanding of the way in which we make sense of discourse and communication. The reason why Heidegger endeavours to find another conception of discourse is related to the fact that he first wants to address the ontological underpinnings of our relation to the worldhood [*Weltlichkeit*] of the world, which for him is fundamental in looking into the existential structure of Dasein as the kind of being that appears as the site and clearing of the understanding of being.

For Heidegger the notion of discourse [*Rede*] amounts to the ancient Greek notion *logos*:

> The Greeks had no word for 'language'; they understood this phenomenon 'in the first instance' as discourse, But because the '*logos*' came into their philosophical ken primarily as assertion, *this* was the kind of *logos* which they took as their clue for working out the basic structures of the forms of discourse and its components.[525]

When Heidegger discusses the notion of *logos* in connection with the etymology of phenomenology[526], he emphasizes the point that Greeks considered *logos* mainly in terms of its assertive qualities, namely as that through which we come to assert judgments. He aims to change the focus by underscoring the phenomenologically more factual appearance of *logos* as discourse. Heidegger suggests, "*logos* as discourse means rather the same as *deloun*: to make manifest what one is 'talking about' in one's discourse."[527] And then he adds, "*Logos* is a letting-something-be-seen".[528] Here, it is clear that

[525] (*Being and Time,* 209)
[526] (*Being and Time*, 32)
[527] (*Being and Time*, 56)
[528] (*Being and Time*, 56)

Heidegger already has in mind the relationship between *aletheia*, phenomenology and *logos*, a threefold relationship that becomes clear through his discussion of discourse and it is clear that the does not understand discourse as the self-expression of the individual.

Heidegger explains the relationship between *logos* and truth as *aletheia* in detail in the 1924–25 Marburg lecture courses, which are published under the title of *Plato's Sophist*. Here, Heidegger brings up the link between language as *logos* and truth as *aletheia* in his examination of Plato's *Sophist* dialogue and Aristotle's notion of *phronesis*. For instance, Heidegger writes: "*Alethein* shows itself most immediately in *legein*. *Legein* (to speak) is what most basically constitutes the human being."[529] It is *logos* that constitutes the human being, not the other way around. It is not some anthropocentric production, but an ontological event that becomes manifest in human beings' talking.

For Heidegger, the ontological-existential meaning of discourse is the articulation of intelligibility (of the world). The vocalization of sounds (speaking) [*Sprechen*] is the action by which one expresses what one wants to make manifest (saying) [*Sagen*]. In that regard, there is a difference between language and discourse even in early Heidegger[530]. Heidegger argues: "Language is a totality of words-a totality in which discourse has a 'worldly' being of its own; and as an entity within-the-world; this totality thus becomes something which we may come across as ready-to-hand."[531] As such, language has two characteristics, the first one being ontological, defined in terms of its own nature, and the second one being practical, in terms of human beings' making use of it: 1) It is a holistic

[529] Martin Heidegger, *Plato's Sophist*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz and Andre Schuwer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997), 17. (From here on: *Plato's Sophist*)
[530] Powell disregards this point when he equals "discourse" with "language", omitting the nuance between act of making manifest (discourse) and the world [*Da*] in which the act of making manifest appears (language) in the first place. In other words, discourse, which always is a communication, is that by which we come to acknowledge the being of language. Powell's negligence is probably due to the fact that he prefers to start his examination of Heidegger's language departing from early Heidegger, where Heidegger himself had not come to address significant distinctions that he made and clarified in his later thought on language. Jeffrey Powell L. "Heidegger and Communicative World". *Research In Phenomenology*, 40 (2010): 59.
[531] (*Being and Time,* 204)

structure that allows one to articulate the facts of one's very life-world via linguistic signs. 2) It is a tool that human beings use in order to share and express the manifestness of beings, and communicate this understanding of the world in discourse.[532] Therefore, an analysis of the notion of the world is necessary, in order to understand the *apophantic* relation between discourse and world, because every time Dasein attempts to say something, it actually speaks *of* its own approximate world, insofar as it understands and interprets the world being spatially captivated in its closest life context.

According to Heidegger, human beings find themselves always already practically involved in the world. Simply by virtue of being in the world, they live in a certain understanding and interpretation of that world.[533] Dasein understands its world because it has no other existential and hermeneutic possibility. In other words, in its "thrownness"[534] [*Geworfenheit*] into the world, its primary mode of being is making sense of things. Furthermore, the understanding that is at stake comes to take place through the way in which Dasein finds itself in the world, which is its existential characteristic of always being in a certain mood [*Befindlichkeit*]. Now, the understanding of the world that is at stake here is not necessarily a theoretical or conceptual recognition, but ordinary know-how, namely knowing one's way around in one's doings in the closest world (environment) [*Umwelt*]. As such, with the most of the things and events around us, we have an immediate and practical "ready-to-hand" [*Zuhandene*] relationship.[535] Only in cases where one's ordinary know-how gets hindered, one has the need to take a step back and try to understand the issue by reflecting upon it. Heidegger calls such a theoretical relation to things "present-to-hand" [*Vorhandene*]. The latter gets activated when the

[532] In the later thought, Heidegger argues that the essence of language is to "say" through "speaking", which can also be understood as discourse. Yet, "*reden*" has a more defined sense of "talking" in the sense of conversing or chatting, while "*sprechen*" designates the more general act of "speaking". So, all "talking" indicates a "speaking", yet not the other way around.
[533] (*Being and Time*, 115-116)
[534] (*Being and Time*, 174)
[535] *(Being and Time*, 103)

ordinary relationship with the things is disturbed. In that framework, the "environment" appears as the space of ordinary understanding and *praxis*. Now, in terms of language, the relation between the world and discourse is as follows: any understanding of the world is followed by an interpretation of it, depending on one's practical concerns and interests (projections) in the world, and this interpretation of the world gets expressed through assertions [*Aussage*] in the course of communication. Communication is the "sharing… with" [*teilen … mit*] of these assertions that emerge from one's interpretations of the world. The way in which these assertions are communicated is "speaking".[536] By way of "speaking", one "says" something *of* the world. The act of speaking embodies a certain understanding and interpretation of the world that becomes explicit through assertions, and the mutual sharing of assertions lead to communication.

Now, according to Heidegger's line of thinking, one can articulate something qua something through assertions if and only if one already has a fore–understanding of what is spoken about.[537] Therefore, discourse always has to be an articulation of the understanding. This is why Heidegger argues, "discourse is existentially equiprimordial with state-of-mind [*Befindlichkeit*] and understanding [*Verstand*]."[538] Even if it is the individual that does the work of expressing, what one articulates is always the understanding of the world that is at issue to which she or he belongs by being *there*, which is determined on the basis of one's practical doings where humans exist by always already having been directed "into" things. In terms of language, this does not mean that everyone speaks in the same way and uses similar expressions in expressing their views and opinions about things, but it means that within the boundaries of ordinary life, where one exists as "being-with" [*Mitsein*], one has the immediate capacity to be able to respond

[536] (*Being and Time*, 203)
[537] (*Being and Time*, 199)
[538] (*Being and Time*, 203)

to things in the most ordinary and common (familiar) *ways* like the "others", the "they". The "they" talk about similar subjects and they do so in light of their shared, similar concerns. This is what catches Heidegger's attention regarding the problem of meaning and understanding, and in particular in relation to the question of the "world". Insofar as discourse is about the entities in the world, it is the understanding and interpretation of the world that determines the horizon of the discourse. Now, the question that we must raise is the following one: what is the nature of the worldhood of the world? How does the world come to determine the "about-which" of speech?

IV. 2 Being-in-the-World, Existential Spatiality, Dreyfus

We must closely scrutinize Heidegger's concept of the "world" [*Welt*], because it is essential in comprehending how he thematizes Dasein's relation to discourse. Heidegger analyses the existential structure of the kind of being for which the question of being appears as an issue, namely, Dasein. Dasein literally means "being-there", here referring to the kind of being that primarily exists as "being-in-the-world". Thus, we must first investigate the meaning of the "world" in *Being and Time*. Subsequently, I would like to address Dreyfus' interpretation of existential spatiality and the notion of place, which will provide us with a perspective to make sense of the topics and issues that are central to Heidegger's ideas in *Being and Time*.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger's understanding of the notion of "world" has spatial underpinnings, as it is initially investigated in terms of its space-related characteristics. On the other hand, Heidegger's primary aim is to show how the spatial essence of the world is grounded in temporality, an approach whose success within the limits of Heidegger's

early thought is uncertain.[539] One of Heidegger's most significant objectives in *Being and Time* is to propose "time" as the horizon of the question of being.[540] Therefore, the trifold relation between spatiality, temporality and place is an important issue that needs close attention. Heidegger indicates that at its core his account of the world is not spatial, and furthermore he associates the spatialist approach with the philosophy of Descartes.[541] Heidegger provides a "temporal" (seen through later Heidegger's lenses, the "journeying" of one's being there) framework in which we can make sense of the authentic Dasein.[542] He first lays out the basis of the inauthentic mode of understanding the world, and then moves on to discussing one's authentic being-there.

The difference between the authentic and inauthentic modes of being there is that the former one implies getting stuck in a one dimensional "presence", while the latter implies a mode of existence in and with the "presencing". In other words, the major distinction is an original conception of "time" and temporality. In that sense, the topological interpretation of *Being and Time* must grasp the role of the, which is related to the later "event" and to the dynamic happening of Dasein's situatedness in the world and discourse. The shift from the "spatial" to the "temporal" also signifies the movement from "space" to "place", since in place the "timing" of time and "spacing" of space is already incorporated.

---

[539] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 65-66. (This becomes an issue in particular in the third chapter of Malpas' book.)
[540] (*Being and Time*, 38)
[541] (*Being and Time*, 94-95)
[542] In addition to Krell's remarks on the issue, we can say that authentic Dasein is able to *situate* itself appropriately in the open-bounded (finite) "dispersion" [*ekstasis*] of *physis* itself. The situation of authentic Dasein, is neither mere "rest" nor "motion" but "rest in motion" and vice versa. From what Aristotle considers the origin of all decaying, time, Heidegger understands the relation in which we stand to the *ekstasis* of time as that which makes possible an authentic or inauthentic relation to place. This is because, it is out of place that the emergence of time and space happens, and place as *topos* (as the open-bounded), is where the time appears finite, yet it temporalizes from the future, which is open and indefinite. David F. Krell, *Intimations of Mortality* (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986), 49-50, 53.

Heidegger indicates four different ways of understanding the "world", the three of which he identifies in the history of philosophy, and a fourth one that he brings up in ontological-existential terms.[543] These four notions of the "world" have two main characteristics. The first two are about "containment", while the last two indicate "involvement". The first and third ones are ontic designations, the first indicating the space in which the totality of things are located, the third one indicating the factual world where one's ordinary life takes place. The second one is an ontological designation, implying the realm in which the being of present-to-hand entities appears, for instance, the world of a mathematician, or a sportsman. The final and the fourth notion of the world designates the "worldhood" of the world, which is the key notion that guides Heidegger's subsequent discussions. It can also be understood as the happening of the "world".

In order to clarify what is at issue, first let me focus on the idea of "in-ness" [*In-Sein*]. For Heidegger, "being-in" [*In-sein*] of Dasein, namely, the way in which Dasein is in the world is not the same as water is in(side) the glass. Dasein's being "in" the world does not render Dasein as an entity merely located and encompassed inside another one.[544] Insofar as being-in for Dasein means a state of being, an *existentiale*, it also means to "dwell". Heidegger argues:

> 'In' is derived from 'innan'-'to reside', 'habitare', 'to dwell' [*sich aufhalten*]'. An' signifies 'I am accustomed', 'I am familiar with', look after something. […] The entity to which Being-in in this signification belongs to is one which we have characterized as that entity which in each case I myself am [*bin*]. [...] 'Ich bin' ['I am'] means in its turn 'I reside' or 'dwell alongside': the world, as that which is familiar to me in such and such a way.[545]

[543] (*Being and Time*, p93)
[544] (*Being and Time*, 79)
[545] (*Being and Time* 80)

It is stated in the footnote of the English translation that Heidegger bases his interpretation on Grimm's etymological investigations. This is where we see the verbal sense of the archaic "*innan*", which according to Grimm precedes the prepositional meaning of the expression. Accordingly, it indicates a kinetic sense of "being-in". Regardless of the correctness of this etymological connection, it is clear that Heidegger understands the "in-ness" [*Inheit*] of human existence not in the sense of being contained in some other spatial phenomenon, but rather in the "onto-ethical" sense of inhabiting a particular life context. It is important to note that Heidegger here associates "being" with "dwelling" in a precise way so that we hear the infinitive "to be" [*Sein*] in the expression "I am" as "I dwell". Accordingly, "I am" means "I am *there"* [*Da*], the "there" here referring to the world, and "being" referring to my dwelling in it. The world essentially signifies "worldhood" [*Weltlichkeit*], meaning the ontological character of the way Dasein is taken up in the world.

The nearest world of human existence is called "environment" [*Umwelt*][546], which is where the factual dwelling of Dasein takes place through its "dealings" [*Umgang*], meaning one's ordinary everyday practices. As such, Heidegger designates the ontological character of the way in which Dasein goes about its dealings as practical, by going back to the Greek word *pragmata* meaning things, matters, deeds. Following that, Heidegger calls the "things" that with which we carry out our concernful dealings as "equipment".[547] There is no single equipment, but always a totality of equipment constituting a holistic context. Dasein's involvement with "things" in the everydayness is what situates Dasein in its "environment". Therefore, there is no "neutral" space in which Dasein is located, but always a particular context determined by Dasein's various actions, practices, and involvements where its "dwelling" takes place. In other words, Dasein is

[546] (*Being and Time*, 94)
[547] (*Being and Time*, 96-97)

not only spatially located in the world, but the worldhood of world appears as such with Dasein's practical involvedness with and in it. Our immediate access to the utility of things constitutes the web-like structure of the world, while tools show up as useful things to the extent that they already belong to a contextual whole. As can be observed with the structure of "in-order-to" [*Um-zu*], this is one of the primary ontological conditions of the being in the world.[548] One does something "in order to" do something else, as there is a totality of references in one's dealings. Just as there is no single equipment, there is no single action or deed either. It is not the total sum of various practices that constitutes the world, but it is Dasein's active participation in things that discloses the worldhood of the world, and our being there in the mode of "existence".

Heidegger advances the notion of "being-in-the-world" as a critique of the Cartesian understanding of human being and its relation to the reality.[549] The Cartesian line of thinking suggests that we can engage with the reality because we are thinking things [*res cogitans*], which is different from merely having a bodily being [*res corporea*] that takes space. Mere corporeal existence indicates sheer extension in the space with no capacity of rational thinking. Insofar as we are thinking (rational) beings, we can step back from our sensory experience of the world in order to cognize phenomena clearly and distinctly by our faculty of thinking. Only insofar as I think [*cogito*] as a rational subject, being conscious of my existence, I can conclude that I *am* [*sum*]. From this very elementary and unshakable knowledge, which for Descartes constitutes the basis of all philosophical-scientific knowledge, I can deduce the existence of the external world. For Heidegger, this relationship must be reversed. It is because I *am*, I can think. Yet, "I *am*" means, "I dwell", that is, insofar as I find myself in the *world*, situated in a context, before I can come to doubt that very context. It is precisely because Descartes isolates his

[548] (*Being and Time*, 98)
[549] (*Being and Time*, 122)

existence from the world in an epistemological register, he can come to doubt his ontological being there. For Heidegger, we cannot doubt the existence of the world, because all questioning depends on the existence of the world and the meaningful presencing of things in the first place. That does not mean that the world is given before me as an object and that I find myself in some already pre-existing objective space, but insofar as I exist, I exist "in-the-world" as part of a particular life context which continually unfolds.

Kant famously states in the *Critique of Pure Reason* that the fact that philosophers still cannot provide a convincing proof of the existence of the outside world is a scandal of philosophy.[550] In response to that, Heidegger believes that the real scandal is that such justifications are still sought: "The 'scandal of philosophy' is not that this proof has yet to be given, but that such proofs are expected and attempted again and again."[551] There can be no grounds that can further ground the being-there of Dasein. "Such expectations, aims, and demands arise from an ontologically inadequate way of starting with something of such a character that independently of it and 'outside' of it a 'world' is to be proved as present-at-hand."[552] This is because, for Heidegger, the world is not some neutral extension [*extensio*] within which we are located as Descartes understands it. The world is precisely what embodies both my so-called mental and practical activities. The being *there* of the human Dasein, insofar as it *is* the being in the *world*, is the "proof" itself of the external world. This means that Dasein's being-there always already provides the ontological "ground" and "horizon", which excludes the necessity of an "epistemological" grounding of that very world. I will return to that point in the last section of the chapter regarding the issue of "groundless grounds".

---

[550] Immanuel Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allan W. Wood (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 121 (B XXXIX).
[551] (*Being and Time*, 249)
[552] (*Being and Time,* 249)

In that context, Dreyfus puts forwards a detailed reading of the notion of "being-in-the-world", which is one of the most influential commentaries in Heidegger scholarship on *Being and Time*. In the rest of this section, I take issue with Dreyfus' commentary, because by discussing his explanation of "existential spatiality", I aim to problematize the neglected aspects of the question of place and dwelling in *Being and Time*. To that end, the emphasis will be given to the connection between "praxis" and "being-in-the-world" via a comparison of "existential spatiality" and "place".

The central argument of Dreyfus is that "skilful coping" determines Dasein's relation to the things[553]. Skilful coping indicates our mindless engagement with things, a comportment toward things that bears no conceptual or theoretical reflection. Skilfully using tools and actively engaging in our ordinary dealings represent a non-conceptual mode of being in the world. As such, skilful coping exemplifies the way in which one appropriately relates oneself to the totality of significances, and thus, to the very way in which being comes to manifest itself through beings. Therefore, a proper understanding of being does not have to be theoretical, and authenticity is possible on the basis of such relation to objects. Rather than theoretical and disengaged cognition, it is skilful coping that enacts and incorporates one's understanding of being.[554]

According to Dreyfus, one's practical involvedness in the world is an embodied way of making sense of our existence in the world[555]. Our understanding of being is embodied in our skills and actions, as our being there is always already put into practice. This differs from the Cartesian view, where the disembodied subject only tries to

[553] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time Division 1* (Cambridge, Mass: The MIT press, 1995), 3.
[554] "Since he calls this more fundamental way of making sense of things our understanding of being, he claims that he is doing ontology, that is, asking about the nature of this understanding of being that we do not know-that is not a representation in the mind corresponding to the world-but that we simply are." Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time Division 1*, 3.
[555] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time Division 1*, 3.

understand the world via disengaged theoretical reflection by detaching oneself from the ordinary world. According to Dreyfus, one does not need to theorize "about" being in order to know it. The best way to "know" the nature of any phenomenon is to skilfully use it. Likewise, the best way to "understand" the meaning of being is to *be* in such a way that being comes to manifest itself through one's relation to things.

The distinction that Dreyfus suggests between the embodied being in the world and disengaged-theoretical reflection may remind us of the two protagonists of Kazantzakis' novel *Zorba the Greek*.[556] It can be helpful to point out their different ways of being in order to show the two-fold nature of the issue at hand in terms of Dasein's relation to the things that are within the world. In the novel, Alexis Zorba is the character that understands the world without theoretically analysing it. His being in the world shows forth a kind of understanding of the world that requires first-order involvement in doing things. He possesses a strong sense of *phronesis*, the kind of practical wisdom that comes with experience and cannot be learned or acquired by reasoning. On the other hand, the young, clumsy, and introverted narrator is the personification of disengaged subject, mainly trying to make sense of the world from distance by detaching himself from first-order experience. While the skilled, crafty and hard working Zorba experiences things with his body, the intellectual narrator, who describes himself as a writer that studies philosophical and religious concepts, tries to make sense of life "theoretically" by observing from afar.

At the very outset of the story, Zorba is immediately drawn to the young narrator who has an alienated appearance, traveling to the island of Crete. The young writer seems to be "out of place", lost in his ideas, his eyes sunk in his book. In the course of their adventure in Crete, the young narrator attempts to help Zorba to understand the world

[556] Nikos Kazantzakis, *Zorba The Greek: The Saint's Life of Zorba*, trans. Peter Bien, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014.

from distance while he himself attempts to learn how to experience the world by being immersed in the very occurrence of things. Apparently, Zorba does not know how to think rationally, while the narrator does not know how to mourn, celebrate, drink, and dance. Zorba usually calls the narrator ironically the "bookworm". At one point, Zorba shouts to the narrator in a state of complete rage: "You listen to what books say, but keep in mind who writes books: teachers! Ptui![557] To hell with them!"[558] In the course of the plot, we see that both Zorba and the young narrator leaving behind their comfort zones and move towards one another, which can remind us of Gadamer's idea of the "fusion of horizons". Their strong friendship is a sense of sharing the place, where their respective horizons fuse into one another.

Now, it can make more sense why Dreyfus prefers to envisage a Zorbaesque Heidegger that reflects via dancing, instead of reflecting "about" the meaning of dancing. According to Dreyfus, since Plato, philosophers have been theorizing about being, but they have forgotten how to be, which is the gist of Heidegger's thinking. In this regard, however, we must conceive that there is no need to appeal to a strict split between theory and practice. In this regard, it is useful to consider what Heidegger argues concerning the envisioned dualism between the "theoretical" and the "practical":

> 'Practical' behaviour is not 'atheoretical' in the sense of 'sightlessness'. The way it differs from theoretical behavior does not lie simply in the fact that in theoretical behavior one observes, while in practical behavior one acts [*gehandelt wird*], and that action must employ theoretical cognition if it is not to remain blind; for the fact that observation is a kind of concern is just as primordial as the fact that action has its own kind of sight.[559]

[557] Spitting on the ground with a sense of disappointment, a common, yet vulgar gesture in the southeastern Mediterranean.
[558] Nikos Kazantzakis, *Zorba The Greek: The Saint's Life of Zorba*, trans. Peter Bien (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014) 244.
[559] (*Being and Time*, 99)

What this means is that just as theory is its own kind of practice, so does practice have its own kind of theory in the sense of "seeing".

In that regard, the debate between Dreyfus and McDowell on the nature of skilful actions is thought provoking, as it sheds light on the distinction between theoretical knowledge and embodiment. Dreyfus puts forward the primacy of mindless absorption as that which defines and constitutes the basis of our skilful practices. In view of this, McDowell argues that the true mastery of an action requires one must be able to provide the reasons and explanations. This, however, as he emphasizes, does not mean that he is advocating the primacy of the so-called mental over the corporeal.[560]

Dreyfus and McDowell discuss the nature of our actions during the game of blitz chess. Dreyfus suggests that during the course of a game, the master player moves the pieces not by consciously thinking about his move. His move is a matter of embodied learning, which results in the kind of experience that leads the chess player to make the necessary move without conscious reflection. He argues, "to sum up: In all domains, masters learn primarily not from analysing their successes and failures but from the results of hundreds of thousands of actions."[561] One learns by customs, having been actively participated in focal activities. The conscious reflection is only activated in some cases where our primary mode of engaging with things and practices does not suffice. In contrast with that view, McDowell argues that mind is not a detached phenomenon and the "mental" does not conflict with the "bodily". On the contrary, following a Kantian line of thinking, the so-called "mental" allows for its own kind of embodiment, which we call

[560] John McDowell, "The Myth of the Mind as the Detached", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 44.
[561] John McDowell, "The Myth of the Mind as the Detached", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear, 35.

experience.[562] McDowell claims that the argument that the master player can move the pieces without theoretical reflection does not entail that he does not know the reasons why he has chosen to play so. "The chess master's being drawn to make his move by the forces on the board is his cultivated rationality at work".[563] For instance, once the game is over, when asked why he had chosen the *a4* opening but not *h4*, he will explain why it was useful or strategically more advantageous to start the game in this way and so forth.

In endorsing the idea of mindless absorption, Dreyfus aims to avoid the representational mode of thinking that separates the "inner" from the "outer", where the inner states of mind produces knowledge about the external reality via representations.[564] As such, he aims to do away with the epistemological (meditational epistemology) mode of inquiry that has been favoured by the philosophical tradition for centuries. Such a mode of disengaged theoretical reflection has been further solidified by the thought of Plato, Descartes and Quine, whom have been finally challenged by many 20th century thinkers such as Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and late Wittgenstein in different ways. However, McDowell contends that not only the structure of experience, but also the very way in which we make sense of the embodied has conceptual underpinnings. Embodied coping is not mere bodily absorption, but first and foremost it becomes cognizable to us as experience insofar as it is conceptual. Pre-conceptual acts never become a subject of experience and all embodied actions are already conceptual because "experience is an actualization of conceptual capacities".[565] Therefore, we should not confuse the "conceptual" with the "theoretical". Even my so-called non-theoretical understanding of

[562] John McDowell, "The Myth of the Mind as the Detached", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear, 43.
[563] John McDowell, "The Myth of the Mind as the Detached", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear, 47.
[564] Hubert L. Dreyfus, Charles Taylor, (2015). *Retrieving Realism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015), 3, 10.
[565] John McDowell, "The Myth of the Mind as the Detached", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 41.

the things has a conceptual background, insofar as my cognition becomes a matter of experience in and through experience, Whether or not I have a theory of the mental states of my experience of the world should not be associated with the idea of the absence of mental states.

In Heidegger scholarship, Braver discusses the Dreyfus-McDowell debate, attempting to reconcile the dispute by showing the pros and cons of each perspective. First, Braver contends the idea that mere skilful coping is sufficient in explaining the relationship between mind and its place in the world. He identifies that Heidegger's last word was not what Dreyfus took to be the central claim in his reading of the first division of *Being and Time*:

> Dreyfus is certainly right that Heidegger favours mindless coping over theoretical analysis, but we must remember that these are not the only options. Division II' s authenticity presents something of an *Aufhebung* [*sublation*] of Division I' s antitheses by marrying coping's engagement to theory's attentiveness. He consistently worries about familiar behavior's tendency to lull us into autopilot, a state he calls fallenness and consistently connects to the unthematic absorption in the world that is Dreyfus's highest state.[566]

In that regard, Montero, for instance, having been trained as a ballet dancer, refutes what she calls the "principle of automaticity", namely that "expert action is natural and easy"[567], which underpins the main argument of Dreyfus. In view of this, Dreyfus makes an even stronger claim by saying that mindedness is the enemy of expert coping. Now, situating himself between Dreyfus and McDowell, Braver claims that our experience of the world could not be explained as a mere total of inferential facts either[568]. What matters first and foremost is that we find ourselves involved in the world, and the very nature of our being

[566] Lee Braver, "Never Mind", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 146.
[567] Barbara Montero, "A Dancer Reflects", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear, 304.
[568] Lee Braver, "Never Mind", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear, 144.

the world is that we are in a holistic whole within which the primacy of the context comes to the fore. This view hints at the necessity to examine the place character of world, and differentiate place from space.

As Braver's line of argument also implies, we require a mode of thinking that neither prioritizes neither "mindless absorption", nor "states of mind" and theoretical analysis. Appealing to a hierarchy that opposes the practical-embodied to the rational-representational does not help thinking. Braver gives an example that draws on our linguistic capacities: Sometimes it occurs to us that we not know how to respond to a question during the class, however this does not prevent us from trying to articulate an answer. Even if we are not exactly sure how to express ourselves, we start speaking with the expectation of being able to providing an answer, hoping to arrive at the thought that will explain the matter. Within the limits of our linguistic capacities, we let the thought to arrive to us.[569] However, it is also obvious that we do not simply "wait". If we do not possess the required competence on the subject, we can never provide a meaningful response. However, if the subject matter is something we have already mastered, we can simply let our thoughts flow, and as such we do not have to follow a prescribed procedure in explicating what is at issue. At that moment of, what we can call, "mindful absorption", one's engagement with the situation is neither "mindless" (because I am consciously searching for an answer), nor merely "theoretical" (because my vision in searching for an answer is particularly blurry). In releasing myself to the subject matter, I hope the situation in which I find myself contextualizes me appropriately. In light of these considerations, now we can look to the relationship between "existential space" and place.

[569] Lee Braver, "Never Mind", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 154.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger distinguishes physical space from existential spatiality[570], an idea that Dreyfus advances in his own account as well. "Existential space" signifies the subjective space in which we actively participate in our affairs in our closest environments. Here, Heidegger's objective is to critique the Cartesian account of the place of the subject in the world. In this regard, Dreyfus makes use of the preliminary distinction between "existential spatiality" and mere "physical space". As I have mentioned, for Dreyfus, Dasein can have an authentic dwelling it copes with things skilfully. In contrast, human existence becomes "worldless" its relationship with the environment [*Umwelt*][571] becomes a mere theoretical engagement. Existential spatiality is the space in which one skilfully copes with things, namely where one has an embodied being in one's world. The neutral physical space indicates the Cartesian, uninhabited, geometrical space.[572] Within that context, Dreyfus argues that "place" is something that is contained in existential spatiality. Namely, the "existential space" is the primary site of dwelling in which we exist, which contains precise places located in the existential space. It is within that context that the relation between space and place must be investigated.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger discusses that "ready-to-hand" things are not available to us as isolated objects. In our practical environments, there are no isolate "objects" [*Res*, *Gegenstand*], but "equipment" [*Zeug*]. Tools in a workshop constitute a totality and they necessitate the utility of one another.[573] For instance, when the screwdriver is missing, the other tools also may turn useless. Although some others tools can replace those that are missing, the place of the tool is irreplaceable. This means that the ready-to-hand availability of every tool brings something unique to its own situation.

[570] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press, 1995), 128.
[571] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time*, 67, 103.
[572] (*Being and Time*, 139)
[573] (*Being and Time*, 97)

Following Heidegger[574], Dreyfus underlines the importance of the notion of "place" in his commentary when he writes, "For example, each tool has a specific *place* in a workshop."[575] The usefulness of each tool is related to the "place" that they hold within the context of a relevant practice. The act of hammering holds a particular "place" within the context of carpentry, which is not linked to its spatial location in the workshop. Therefore the "location" of the tool does not amount to its "place". In that line of thinking, for Dreyfus, the question of "place" does not become explicit at all on its own accord other than as the specific locality in existential space that is opened up within the context of one's dealings. In what follows I will critique Dreyfus' account on the relationship between space and place.

Dreyfus's thinking implies that "existential spatiality" amounts to what later Heidegger calls site or place [*Ort*, *Ortschaft*] that within which dwelling takes place. Dreyfus distinguishes the space-making and space-giving character of place from inhabited, geometrical space. This is similar to the understanding of the relationship between space and place that Heidegger addresses in his very late *Art and Space* essay.[576] On the other hand, acknowledging the distinction between "existential space", meaning the site of onto-ethical dwelling and mere geometrical, inhabited space risks reinforcing the Cartesian dualism, separating the bodily dimension of practice from the so–called geometrical and disengaged, pure extension.[577] Only inverting the Cartesian paradigm and prioritizing the "bodily" realm of space does not ground the relation between "existential

---

[574] (*Being and Time*, 136)

[575] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press, 1995), 129.

[576] Martin Heidegger, "Art and Space", trans. Charles Siebert, *Man and World* 6 (1973): 3–8. (GA13: 203–210)

[577] A similar critique of Dreyfus' work comes from Braver where he argues:
"I find much of value in Dreyfus's analyses, but his restriction of engaged, solicited coping to embodied interactions with the physical environment ends up looking like a vestigial Cartesian mind–body split, where the body is intelligent precisely where the mind is stupid and vice versa". Lee Braver, "Never Mind", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 152.

spatiality" and "geometrical-physical space". In other words, in Dreyfus' account what lacks is the event of place, which is due to his negligence of later Heidegger's understanding of dwelling as the fourfold, which problematizes the happening of place. Dreyfus overlooks the necessity of an explicit notion of place by making sense of "existential spatiality" as the ultimate meaning of dwelling, bearing on the consequences of the incomplete account of space and place in Heidegger's early thought. In Heidegger scholarship, it is Malpas who criticizes Dreyfus on the same issue.[578] Malpas' point is that Dreyfus' distinction between "existential spatiality" and "objective spatiality" does not clarify the subject matter, but on the contrary, it renders the issue even more problematic..

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger implies a way to consider the relationship between place and space, which can be connected to to his later account as well. He argues:

> Dasein takes space in; this is to be understood literally […] In existing, it has already made room for its own leeway [*Spielraum*]. It determines its own location in such a manner that it comes back from the space it has made room for to the 'place' which it has reserved. [579]

As we have seen, later Heidegger argued that it is the "saying" [*das Sage*] that makes room for this "leeway". The "way-making" of language was the primary occurrence that made space for the relation between human being and being itself in bringing them into their interplay and interaction. As Heidegger states above, it is not Dasein that makes space, but on the contrary, human Dasein takes space in, which results from its being-there [*Da*-sein], in the world. The "space" that is at issue here with regards to the being of Dasein is not about "existential space", which for Dreyfus is in each and every case is related to human beings' actions and doings. Insofar as Dasein exists as the "there" of the

[578] Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*, (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 78.
[579] (*Being and Time*, 418)

manifestation of "being", it always and already exists in the "leeway" that makes room for the place that is at issue. The place does not appear only in terms of human equipment and skilful coping, but first and foremost in terms of the situatedness of human being in existence, in terms of its openness to the meaningful unfolding of things. "Existential spatiality" is derivative of that primary "leeway", which can be understood as the very interplay of space in terms of the occurrence between "the there" and "existential space" in which the practical involvement with things may take place. Associating space and place with the mere location of tools is a subjectivist reading that obscures the link between "existential spatiality" and place. Place is not a particular location in space, and existential spatiality first needs the spacing that Dasein "takes in", which, in *Being and Time*, is possible in terms of temporality.[580]

The spatial essence of the "leeway" can be understood by looking to Dasein's "de-severant" nature. Accordingly, Dasein's spatiality has two sources: "de-severance" [*Entfernung*] and "directionality" [*Ausrichtung*].[581] The former signifies the facticity of Dasein, that is, Dasein has the capacity to render *pragmata* ready-to-hand by bringing them closer its ordinary dealings. "Dasein, in accordance with its spatiality, is proximally never here but yonder; from this 'yonder' it comes back to its 'here'"[582]. The reason is that Dasein's place in the world does not mean a mere location in space, but its circumspective nearness to things. On the other hand, we must note that in making something ready-to-hand, the falling [*Verfall*] as the essential structure of "care" [*Sorge*] appears. Being mindlessly absorbed does not reveal existential space, but first and foremost it yields to

[580] It is indeed possible to argue that the fact temporality is derivative of spatiality is a problematic idea, especially if both space and time are essential elements of place. This is an idea that I have explicated in the first chapter of my dissertation with regards to the paired notions of the "journeying of place" and the "place of journeying". It makes more sense to argue that spatiality and temporality are what emerge from place, the latter meaning that in which any situatedness in existence takes place.
[581] (*Being and Time*, 138)
[582] (*Being and Time*, 142)

the forgetting of the "yonder" [*das Dort*] of things. In making things ready-to-hand in the here [*das Hier*], the "presencing" (the taking place of temporality as the later "journeying") itself gets omitted for the sake of the "presence" (spatiality). Mindless absorption, when temporally understood, results in the falling.[583] For Heidegger, "inauthenticity" does not mean anything like being no longer mindfully present in the world, but rather it amounts a quite distinctive kind of being-in-the-world –a mode of being in which one is overly fascinated by the "world" and the being there of others in the world.[584] Where do we see a hint of the shift from "existential spatiality" to "place" in *Being and Time*? It is when Heidegger argues that existential spatiality is grounded in Dasein's "being-in-the-world", which can be disclosed insofar as there is the "there". "Dasein its disclosedness".[585]

Despite his negligence of the notion of place, Dreyfus derives the idea of authentic dwelling from Dasein's absorption in its ordinary dealings. We must bear in mind that in Heidegger's early thought, a genuine possibility of "dwelling" does not emerge on the basis of the "spatiality", but "temporality", which is indeed related to the issue of "care" [*Sorge*] as the meaning of Dasein's being in the world. Dasein always exists in moving towards its future, which is the essence of its "thrownness". It is thrown into infinite amount of possibilities, but among them there is only one definitive possibility, which defines all others: the death. In turn, "being-towards-death" [*Sein-zum-Tode*] can be authentic if and only if Dasein exists in "anticipatory resoluteness".

Here, the notion of "resoluteness" [*Entschlossenheit*] is particularly significant as it is directly related to the notion of "disclosedness" [*Erschlossenheit*] of things. Authentic dwelling becomes possible in the "resolute" acknowledgment of its own most possibility

[583] (*Being and Time*, 421)
[584] (*Being and Time*, 220)
[585] (*Being and Time*, 170)

where Dasein can try to become its own self by daring to die its own death, or else it can get lost in the sphere of the everydayness. Resoluteness brings Dasein to its unique disclosedness, and as such, into its proper "way" that arrives at the clearing [*Lichtung*]. In other words, in following its proper access, or "leeway" to being-there, one's existence can unfold possibilities of a unique mode of being in the world. The possibility of authentic dwelling, then, is not to be found in one's spatially determined "being-in" but in its "being-towards", "Being-towards-death" releases Dasein from the boundaries of its "close world" [*Um-welt*] to the "world" itself in the manner of bringing it back to itself. As Heidegger writes: "Inauthentic understanding projects itself upon that with which one can concern oneself, or upon what is feasible, urgent, or indispensable in our everyday business"[586], Yet, Dreyfus claims, "*What is near is that with which I am currently absorbedly coping*".[587] This view holds true with regards to the fact for Heidegger "nearness" is not a spatial issue, since we cannot decide whether phenomena are "near" only based on their proximity in space. According to Dreyfus, what is near is that with which we are practically "coping" in a skilful way. However, the fact that the nearest is where we have concernful dealings does not mean either that all absorbed coping deliver authentic dwelling. In that line of thinking, Braver argues:

> Certainly, Division I of *Being and Time* sets up a contrast between the absorbed, engaged use of tools and detached theoretical "just staring at" objects, with a clear preference for the former. However, this initial opposition does not exhaust Heidegger's treatment of the matter; Division II emphasizes phenomena that knock us out of our unreflective routine such as breakdowns, resistance, and unfamiliarity.[588]

[586] (*Being and Time*, 386)
[587] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press, 1995), 134.
[588] Lee Braver, "Never Mind", in *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*, ed. Joseph K. Schear (London and New York: Routledge, 2013), 145.

It is the *das Man*, that is, "the they", human subject that is swamped in the ordinary understanding of things who is absorbed and mindless. In *Being and Time*, the source of the possibility of a different relation to the world is anxiety [*Angst*], which provides the possibility of freeing oneself from the ordinariness of "the they" [*das Man*], as its basic topological character is that it displaces us from where we find ourselves in the midst of things, from the ordinary interpretation of *pragmata*. Anxiety is not the same as having a fear of height, or being afraid of the spider on the wall. "Anxiety is anxious in the face of the 'nothing' of the world; but this does not mean that in anxiety we experience something like the absence of what is present-at-hand within-the-world.[589] With anxiety, we encounter the groundless grounds of our involvement in the world. Nevertheless, it is precisely out of this confrontation with the "no-thing" character of our being in the world the possibility of dwelling arises. Anxiety dis-places us from the boundaries of the "environment" and thus re-orients in the journeying between the here and the yonder, where the world may appear in its wholeness and completion. The experience of anxiety shows forth the possibility of engaging with one's close world and dwelling occurs neither when we are absorbed in nor detached from the world, but when we come to learn to re-inhabit the world.

IV. 3 Groundlessness of Discourse: Idle-Talk

Thus far, I have discussed the meaning of discourse and brought into view the relation between "existential spatiality", "being-in-the-world" and place by challenging Dreyfus' idea of mindless absorption. In this section, I am primarily concerned with the nature of our relation to discourse in the world, because this is the idea that is particularly

[589] (*Being and Time*, 393)

significant in Heidegger's early thought on language. Heidegger's discussion of the nature of human being's inauthentic relation to discourse has implicit, yet strong topological underpinnings that are not sufficiently documented in Heidegger scholarship. My primary aim is to make them more discernible. I do not argue that in *Being and Time* Heidegger has a complete account of topology of being and language or that his later topology is entirely built on the ideas that appear in *Being and Time*. That being said, fully understanding the way in which Heidegger makes an issue of the inauthentic form of discourse, namely, idle-talk [*Gerede*], requires a place-oriented thinking. Doing so can also pave the way for a topologically sympathetic reading of early Heidegger, where some hints of his later account can be discovered.

First we should clarify the meaning of inauthenticity. Heidegger argues that in submitting and surrendering itself to the world, Dasein can come to have an encompassing sense of "concern" [*Sorge*] for its ordinary being there to the extent of coming to evade its own self.[590] This state of finding oneself surrounded by the ordinary everydayness designates the "falling" [*Verfall*] of human Dasein. It is important to remember that, for Heidegger, this does not indicate a moral decay of the individual, but rather it signifies an ontological tendency of human existence in general. Heidegger writes: "Idle talk, curiosity and ambiguity characterize the way in which, in an everyday manner, Dasein is its 'there'- the disclosedness of Being-in-the-world."[591] In other words, it is through these three existential characterizations of its being there that we can have a clue as to how Dasein discloses its world and environment.

"The one" or "the they", namely "anyone" [*Das Man*] designates the inauthentic characterization of Dasein's average being in the world. As such, there are two modes of being for Dasein in the everydayness: 1) "One" deals with one's affairs in the same way

[590] (*Being and Time*, 178)
[591] (*Being and Time*, 219)

everyone else does, that is, Dasein chooses to be like *anyone* [*das Man*], or 2) one exists by making one's being there one's "own" [*Eigene*], which indicates an authentic [*eigentlich*] way of comporting oneself toward things. "Authentic" does not mean "original" or "novel" in the sense of "never seen before", but it simply denotes taking responsibility for one's existence by responding to one's own and unique being-there. That is to say, one can choose to respond to her or his own being there in a way that only she or he can do. In this way, one's existence may manifest a unique access to the clearing of being [*Lichtung*]. In each and every case, it is through my "being-there" that I have the possibility of an authentic understanding of being in the world [*Jemeingikeit*]. If the utmost possibility of authenticity lies in dying one's own death, it means that authenticity is the proper way in which one journeys towards its own absence in the world. As such, it is a way of abandoning mere absorption and containment with an eye to embracing one's finite being. Now, let me explain how this is tied to the question of discourse and language.

For Heidegger, "idle-talk" [*Gerede*] denotes our inauthentic relation to discourse. In *Being and Time*, the notion primarily appears as the "groundlessness" [*Bodenlosigkeit*][592] of discourse. If discourse means the linguistic articulation of the world, an inauthentic manner of relating oneself to discourse is the constant "uprooting" of the way in which human Dasein understands, interprets, and makes manifest its own being-there. It is useful to mention that although "idle-talk" is the groundlessness of discourse, it is still grounded in discourse. In other words, "idle-talk" simply refers to a mode of discourse that is grounded in one's absorbed being in the everydayness. Underscoring the ontological underpinnings of this state of being, Heidegger argues, "In no case is Dasein, untouched and unseduced by this way in which things have been

[592] (*Being and Time,* 221)

interpreted, set before the open country of a 'world-in-itself', so that it just beholds what it encounters."[593] Only insofar as idle-talk lures Dasein in an ontological way, a genuine relationship to discourse in the everydayness can also be possible. Idle-talk is not something we can do away with at will, it simply happens, and it happens all the time.[594] In that sense, idle-talk manifests a certain understanding of the world; however, it does not show the authentic possibilities of human existence. What it can show forth is the average understanding of the there [*Da*] (world).

According to Heidegger, remaining in the average understanding and interpretation of the world implies an "uprooted" mode of dwelling. "Idle–talk, which closes things off […] belongs to Dasein's understanding when that understanding has been uprooted".[595] The "uprooting" character of idle-talk, which is "constant", leaves human Dasein without a ground, while still giving the illusion of being grounded. "Proximally and for the most part Dasein is lost in its 'world'."[596] It is lost, because it situated itself only in the midst of things, and as such moved away from the possibility of having a horizon of things its being in the world.

It is necessary to note that the uprooting character of idle-talk is linked to the issue of "truth of being" as *aletheia*. As I have discussed, Heidegger suggests that *legein* of *logos* makes manifest and gathers. In the course of communication, we try to make an issue manifest for the other. That is the meaning of letting the other see what one has disclosed for oneself. Communication [*Mitteilung*] is the "sharing" of what has become manifest for us "with" the other [*teilen … mit*].[597] However, here we need a distinction between the two senses of "disclosing" and "making manifest". This distinction is already

[593] (*Being and Time*, 213)
[594] This is the dilemma that a spatial reading of *Being and Time* faces. In effect, Heidegger attempts to determine time as the horizon of being precisely for this reason, as to attempt to find a way out of one's spatial absorbedness in one's life–world.
[595] (*Being and Time*, 214)
[596] (*Being and Time*, 264)
[597] (*Being and Time*, 197)

observable in Heidegger's 1924–25 lectures, in his exposition of the way in which Aristotle deploys the notion of *aletheuin* [un–concealing, making manifest, disclosing] in *The Nichomachean Ethics*.[598] Accordingly, there are five ways of disclosing beings: (1) know–how, (2) science, (3) circumspection, (4) understanding, and (5) perceptual discernment. All of these various ways of disclosure are related to *logos*.[599] However, there is a difference between "*logos*" and "*legomenon*". While in the former, one can originally make something manifest, in the latter, one can simply reiterate something that has already become apparent. Heidegger argues, "in ordinary conversation one adheres to what is said, and, in hearing what is said, real knowledge is not necessarily achieved each time".[600] In *legomenon*, we apply the signs as ready-to-hand substances, disregarding the interval between the words and the signs. *Legomenon*, which denotes "the spoken" word, is derives from the *legein* of *logos*, namely the self-manifesting and gathering character of discourse. Heidegger designates the latter use of *logos* as, "where we are not able to appropriate everything originally" and "that had lost its original position".[601] The original positioning of the words require the emergence of different meanings, indicating the manifoldness of the contexts from which they appear. On the other hand, the basic determination of the being of human beings in Aristotle's "*zoon logon echon*" does not indicate the human existence's ability to partake in "*legomenon*" and communication. "Anyone" [*das Man*] can communicate; yet this everyday mode of "sharing with" of discourse does not show us what is peculiar about language.

"Communication", in that narrow sense, could be extended to include most animals and organisms on earth that can simply communicate by vocalized sounds, signals, and other senses. However, what gives human beings their "humanness", that

[598] (*Plato's Sophist*, 12)
[599] (*Plato's Sophist*, 16)
[600] (*Plato's Sophist*, 18)
[601] (*Plato's Sophist*, 18)

which makes them the peculiar kind of beings that they are, is not only their ability to communicate (sharing … with) their biological and psychological desires and needs (which other organisms can do in their own ways too), but to "bring forth" things in their being. This second kind of making manifest is no longer mere "*legomenon*", but *logos* in the sense of disclosing the thing as the thing by recognizing their properness to our understanding. Idle-talk, on the other hand, conceals the disclosure of the being of beings as our inauthentic relation to discourse.

Now, within that context, the "lostness" of human existence in its inauthentic relation to discourse does not lie in the mere coveredness of entities, but on the contrary, it lies in the average uncoveredness of them. "One" [*das Man*] simply believes that one has already understands things. This designates the kind of comportment towards beings as if everything has already come to full disclosure in the average understanding of the world. What gives rise to inauthenticity is not that in the ordinary life one does not know about this or that, but that one thinks that one already knows and understands everything about it, while only having a very little understanding of it.[602] In other words, it is not the "ignorance", but the "ignorance of one's ignorance" that manifests uprootedness, which essentially conceals the possibility of the disclosure of being(s) itself. Heidegger italicizes the following statement in order to emphasize this very point: "*Because Dasein is essentially falling, its state of being is as such that it is in 'untruth'*".[603]

The essence of discourse lies in making the meaning of beings manifest, even in the ordinary use of language. Discourse is the articulation of the "being-there" of human beings, which in each and every case is "being-there-with" [*Mitdasein*]. In the inauthentic

[602] Indeed this is not a new perspective, as Plato has already demonstrated in the *Republic* the very same idea with the Cave analogy.
[603] It is evident here that Heidegger was already making use of the Greek notion "*aletheia*" as the truth as unconcealment in his discussion on discourse and the authenticity of human Dasein. (*Being and Time,* 264)

way of understanding one's world, one understands its "there", the openness of making sense of the world, only in a superficial [*durchschnittlich*] way, and it can only disclose beings determined by the "average" intelligibility of its "there". Heidegger puts it as follows: "'idle talk'" is the possibility of understanding everything without making the thing one's own."[604] In order to be able to have an authentic relation to discourse, one has to avoid adopting formulas, stereotypes, and generalizations through discourse. This can become an issue by first and foremost problematizing one's "being-there" not as mere "coping", but as dwelling. To that end, what one needs is a simultaneous and two-way movement of "distancing" and "nearing". One must move away from the boundaries of the everyday, not necessarily in order to live as a hermit, but in order to bring oneself back to one's ordinary world in an authentic way. What that means is that an authentic mode of being is possible within the limits of one's ordinary being there, however only insofar as one can make sense of the extraordinariness of existence (that simply things are). As such, one may find the interval in and through which one no longer merely copes with things, but where one can actually stand in a disclosive relation to things. It is within that "leeway" that one's dwelling can transpire. In terms of Gadamer's philosophy, it would mean to have a horizon in one's doings, so that one would not be limited to the cultural norms and values of a particular life-world, but actually manage to see "beyond" what has become available "here". In that sense, the space opened up by the horizon would signify a movement from "here" to "yonder", and this very movement would be the appropriate inhabiting of the world in the "there" [*Da*] as the between. In such a mode of being, one neither merely submits to nor reactively contradicts the norms and traditions of one's life world, but rather one could incorporate and enact one's existence within the limits of ordinary being-there.

[604] (*Being and Time,* 213)

On this note, Dreyfus acknowledges the ways in which Heidegger makes an issue of the authentic and inauthentic relation to the everydayness. According to Dreyfus[605], idle-talk [*Gerede*] appears as the "misuse" of the ontological structure of our ordinary being in the world. This means that Dreyfus wants to show that the ordinary use of language still can be authentic without needing to be idle-talk. Although Dreyfus' argument is correct, the following point needs to be acknowledged. If "falling" is an inherent ontological possibility of "being-in-the-world" of Dasein, and if such falling emerges from the ontological tendency to "flee" the authentic possibilities of dwelling, then, absorbed-mindless human Dasein could not escape from inauthenticity. Its ontological nature leads Dasein to settle in the conformity of the average publicness. With this idea, we can identify the following idea: in *Being and Time*, mere settledness in one's closest world does not spontaneously result in authentic dwelling, but on the contrary, more often it denotes a sense of "fleeing". "Fleeing" does not annihilate the "inness" of Dasein's being in the world, but it gets in the way of Dasein's authentic disclosure of the world, just as the proximal "in–ness" does not necessarily mean "nearness". The following passage from *Being and Time* is worth considering:

> By this time we can see phenomenally what falling, as fleeing, flees in the face of. It does not flee *in the face of* entities within–the–world; these are precisely what it flees *towards*– as entities alongside which our concern, lost in the "they", can dwell in tranquillized familiarity. When in falling, we flee into the "at–home" of publicness, we flee *in the face* of the "not–at–home": that is, we flee in the face of the uncanniness which lies in Dasein.[606]

This is a key idea also in Heidegger's thinking in the mid-1940s, becoming an important issue essentially in *The Ister* lectures, which I have discussed in the first chapter regarding

[605] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press, 1995), 227.
[606] (*Being and Time*, 233)

the relation between nearness and distance. The loss of the possibility of dwelling, namely "fleeing", that takes place in the uprootedness of "the they", can also be observed in Heidegger's discussion of "curiosity" [*Neugier*]. The idle chatter constantly strives to keep everything in one's sight and tries to "see" the "new" all the time. "The they" is caught up in the incessant need for the new, and thus can never "dwell on" things. One "seeks constantly to run away from the awaiting in which it is nevertheless 'held', though not held on to."[607] In already "looking away" from what has become present, one "abandons", and thus in a certain sense "flees" in a mode of "distraction". Distraction here should also be understood topologically, in the sense of being "derailed" from one's "way", namely "the leeway" in and through which "existential spatiality" becomes possible in the first place. As Heidegger states, "[t]he distracted not-tarrying becomes *never-dwelling-anywhere*. […] In never dwelling anywhere, Being-there is everywhere and nowhere." [608]

In that regard, let me highlight a point that is not sufficiently emphasized in *Being and Time*. In his 1924-25 lecture courses, Heidegger argues that as a result of the inadequacy of our relation to language in everydayness, ordinary discourse tends to conceal the meaning of phenomena.[609] We make phenomena manifest within the boundaries of average intelligibility. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger mentions "poetical discourse" as a higher use of language. He suggests: "In poetical discourse, communication of the existential possibilities of one's "state–of–mind" [*Befindlichkeit*] can become an aim in itself, and this amounts to a disclosing of existence"[610]. Existence here means the temporal wholeness of the "being-there" of human beings, which in every moment is journeying towards its absence in the world. In poetical discourse, what comes to the fore is the basic fact that human beings find themselves thrown into the world.

[607] (*Being and Time*, 397)
[608] (*Being and Time*, 398)
[609] (*Plato's Sophist*, 11)
[610] (*Being and Time*, 205)

However, it is not useful to dualistically contrast "poetical" or "ordinary discourse". It is essential to learn to stand in a poetic relation to ordinary language, so that poetic discourse may discover and make manifest the limits everyday discourse, while ordinary discourse may overcome the average understanding and interpretation of the world. The reason why this point does not become obvious in *Being and Time* is that Heidegger does not undertake an analysis of human Dasein's poetic relationship to language, which is indeed linked to the fact that the question of place and language do not become explicit on their own terms.

Now, one of the key issues that Heidegger leaves undecided in *Being and Time* is whether Dasein is capable of posing the question of the meaning of being authentically. Is Dasein simply stuck in the average understanding of being because of its superficial relation to "beings"? We can try to provide an answer to these questions on the basis of Dasein's relation to discourse. Human Dasein partakes in familiar and everyday practices and when it comes to speaking one's own language, it understands and speaks about "anything" effortlessly. However, it is particularly this "fluency" in discourse that can threaten the authenticity of human Dasein's relation to language. In such fluency, beings may manifest themselves only in a mode of mere presence, which may lead human existence to forget the necessity of engaging in a constant confrontation with one's understanding of the world by making language an issue. For instance, Dreyfus states: "Once one has been socialized into a community's practices, as long as one dwells in those practices rather than taking a detached point of view, words are simply heard and seen as meaningful"[611]. However, inasmuch as Dasein understands every single thing that it hears and sees, all that it "fluently" understands by absorbedly coping amounts only to the average interpretation of the world. This is also a view that Wrathall develops against

[611] Hubert L. Dreyfus, *Being-In-The-World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT press, 1995), 219.

Dreyfus. Wrathall's critical remark on this issue shows that he acknowledges the significance of Heidegger's later thought regarding our poetic relation to language:

> Heidegger wants us to break out of our ordinary facility with language in order to actually have an experience with language itself. Our everyday speech is so habitual, so commonplace, and so familiar that language itself escapes notice, indeed, is nearly invisible. As a result, to gain insight into it, we need to be able to attend to it, experience it, and reflect on it, and this might require that we somehow defamiliarize ourselves with it. [612]

Within that framework, in what follows I will show that such a poetic experience of language is possible only by experiencing the boundaries of discourse by keeping silent. This is where we find the onto-ethical possibility of confronting the limits of "idle-talk" and avoid mere absorption in idle chatter.

IV. 4 The Abyss of Discourse: Silence

In *Being and Time*, the openness and the interval that allows human existence to stand in a poetic relation to language appears as "keeping silent", which can be appropriately grasped with a topological scrutiny. This is because "keeping silent" signifies a distinct mode of approaching discourse, which embodies an authentic understanding and interpretation of the world. In *Being and Time*, it is the discussion of the ontological meaning of silence that connects early Heidegger and later Heidegger on the issue of language.

Dasein's authentic relation to discourse and language appears in the second chapter of the second division on the issue concerning the "call of conscience" (sections 55-58). The idea of silence and keeping silent appears as the "abyss" of discourse, which needs to

[612] Mark A. Wrathall, *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 138.

be distinguished from the "groundlessness" of discourse as "idle-talk". The former term designates the site in which we may experience the limits of discourse, where an understanding of the happening of discourse as such appears. The latter designates the uprooted mode of being stuck in discourse, where our experience of it becomes concealed.

According to Heidegger, discourse has two components: "hearing" [*Hören*] and "keeping silent" [*Schweigen*].[613] "Keeping silent" shows up as the ground of the authentic ontological possibility of making things manifest. In that sense, it is the opposite of "idle-talk" that uproots and leads the human Dasein to understand the world inauthentically. In this regard, the topologically relevant contrast here is concerning the "uprooting" character of "idle-talk" and the "grounding" character of "silence", both of which are place-related designations of human existence's relation to discourse.

In *Being and Time*, the issue of authenticity does not appear in moralistic terms, but within an existential framework[614], as the appropriate way in which one makes an issue of "being-towards-death". The inauthentic Dasein is absorbed in a superficial understanding of the world and lives with the "forgetfulness of being", without ever acknowledging it. It is simply stuck in "idle-talk". "Keeping silent", which resembles the later notion of "releasement" [*Gelassenheit*], is the way in which human Dasein can resist "idle-talk". in *Being and Time,* "reticence" [*Verschwiegenheit*], or "keeping silent", provides the topological connection to the ground of language as silence (or stillness). The idea of the ground of language as silence is also what middle and later Heidegger endorses, as I have also shown in the third chapter.[615]

---

[613] (*Being and Time*, 204)

[614] Heidegger discourages reading *Being and Time* in these lines of thinking. See: Martin Heidegger, *Mindfulness*. trans. Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary (New York: Continuum, 2006), 367.

[615] "Language is grounded in silence." (*Contributions to Philosophy*, 401)

The idea is that "keeping silent" can be understood as a more adequate mode of "showing" compared to "speaking-at-length" [*viel–sprechen*][616] about them. That said, it must be noted that "keeping silent" does not mean "speaking little" or that one can make an issue manifest simply by not saying a word. "Keeping silent" is the act of incorporating "silence" via "listening". In "keeping silent", one can "hear" what remains unintelligible to inauthentic Dasein who is absorbed and lost in abundance of things to express. In other words, inauthentic Dasein speaks too much, while not saying anything. In the 1924–25 lecture *History of the Concept of Time,* as well as in *Being and Time*, Heidegger argues for the same point: (1) Silence is the key constituent of discourse, (2) Silence is not mere muteness, or lack of utterance.[617] Accordingly, "keeping silent has been characterized as an essential possibility of discourse. Anyone who keeps silent when he wants to give us to understand something, must 'have something to say'"[618]. Here, it appears again that "having something to say" differs fundamentally from simply participating in "discourse" by being talkative. "Idle-talk" is the superficial manifestation of "discourse" [*Rede*]; the absence of a clear sight to discern whether what one talks about actually says (shows) something. "Keeping silent", on the other hand, only truly emerges when both the possibility of staying silent and talking-at-length occurs as two distinct possibilities. The ability to step back from "idle-talk", whose essence is "talking-at length", to "keep silent" is the way and journeying from discourse to silence, where an original experience of being in language takes place.

An authentic relation to language requires one to situate oneself *between* "silence" and "discourse" by "keeping silent". This requires one to remain constantly open to both speaking and silence by corresponding to the situation appropriately. The possibility of

[616] (*Being and Time*, 208)
[617] Martin Heidegger, *History of the Concept of Time*, trans. Thedore Kisiel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 267.
[618] (*Being and Time,* 342)

authentic discourse, then, roots from "keeping silent", which is the taking place of "the between", and not from talkativeness or mere muteness. "Silence" is not the lack of "idle-talk" or "discourse", but these three elements should be regarded in a unity as various manifestations of language[619].

It is significant that "remaining-silent" and "hearing" reappear in the later sections of *Being and Time*, though, not within the context of the ontological nature of discourse. It is "conscience" [*Gewissen*] that appears as the *site*[620] of the transition from the inauthenticity to authenticity. In that regard, there is an explicit link between conscience and authentic discourse. Accordingly, in the sections 55–57, Heidegger delivers his discussion of the "voice of conscience" [*Stimme des Gewissens*] within the context of human Dasein's "being towards death". Due to its ontological structure, the "call of conscience" is neither a ready-to-hand nor present-to-hand entity, as it shows up through a mode of disclosure, emerging from human Dasein's temporal finitude. "Conscience gives us something to understand, it *discloses*"[621]. Heidegger goes on to argue that the "voice of conscience" occurs as a "call" [*Ruf*]. In the everydayness, human beings are not attentive to the crucial concerns of existence, in that they "fail to notice" [*übersehen*], or in the case of hearing and listening, they "fail to hear" [*überhören, hinhören*] that which actually

[619] Later Heidegger makes this relationship much clearer. In the 1950s, Heidegger argues that listening and saying are not two opposites as it is often thought to be. Listening is not detached from saying, as much as saying is not separable from listening. Heidegger argues: "But speaking is at the same time also listening. It is the custom to put speaking and listening in opposition: one man speaks, the other listens. But listening accompanies and surround, not only speaking such as takes place in conversation. The simultaneousness of speaking and listening has a larger meaning. Speaking is of itself a listening. Speaking is listening to the language which we speak. Thus, it is a listening not *while* but *before* we are speaking." (*On the Way to Language,* 123)

[620] Brogan also considers Dasein as the "site" in which the authentic Dasein and inauthentic Dasein, namely "the they" get into a dialogue. More specifically, the inauthentic Dasein is the "site" in which the authentic Dasein can come to appear; therefore they remain in a two-fold relationship. This must be understood as follows: The inauthentic Dasein prepares the possibility of a "genuine existential communication" insofar as "the They" collapses having lost its refuge in "idle-talk" and gossiping around. In other words, it is derailed from its common and habitual dwelling place. Walter Brogan, "Listening to Silence: Reticence and the Call of Conscience in Heidegger's Philosophy", in *Heidegger and Language*, ed. Jeffrey Powell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 34-36.

[621] (*Being and Time*, 314)

matters. This means, in the everydayness human beings see or hear the "surface" of things. In other words, ordinary Dasein is ontologically prone to overlook the most decisive matters of existence such as death. This is not because ordinary affairs are superficial engagements per se, but because inauthentic Dasein can only superficially relate to them. Therefore, absorption in idle-talk provides no access to an authentic relation to language. As such, in idle-talk there can be no "dwelling", but only a mere "containment" in the presence of speaking.

Now, as I explicated, mere "speaking" [*sprechen*] does not always imply "making manifest". Conversely, in "calling" [*Ruf*], the conscience makes manifest *without* speech. The call of conscience speaks "no-thing". It conveys "no-thing" and it comes from "no-where". It gives no information regarding one's existential situation, and it provides no guidelines as how to act. In listening to the "call of conscience", one takes a step back from discourse where "hearkening" shows up. As such, speaking and listening come into a "dialogue" in the manifestation of the call of conscience, which says no-thing.[622] It is a dialogue, because in hearkening, "the Self, which the appeal has robbed of this lodgement and hiding-place, gets brought to itself by the call."[623]

Though the "call" transmits "no-thing", the call of conscience is a ground–breaking event, one that brings Dasein to encounter its being in its entirety. In other words, the "call of conscience" brings the human Dasein into a unique "situation", a "state of mind", where Dasein encounters its own nothingness in its journeying toward death. As such, the "call of conscience" shows forth "nothingness" [*Nichts*] itself, which is related to

[622] Schalow also indicates the importance of acknowledging the two–fold relationship between saying and listening: "While Heidegger maintains that the call of conscience provides the first clue to Dasein's participation in the disclosive power of language, scholars often overlook the dialogic power of this silent voice. For in saying 'nothing,' the call of conscience illustrates that hearing precedes saying, and hence it is only by first 'listening' that human beings acquire the power to speak". Frank Schalow, "Freedom, Finitude, and the Practical Self: The Other Side of Heidegger's Appropriation of Kant", in *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*, ed. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Albany: SUNY Press, 2002), 38.
[623] (*Being and Time*, 317)

the idea of the "abyss" of discourse. If "no-thing" can be designated as that which refuses to be conceived of as a being, the site of the call of conscience can also be described as "no-where". It grounds discourse, yet it does not speak. The "call of conscience" does not have its origin in a "physical" or a "metaphysical" realm: it is *ou-topos*. The place of the call appears to be linguistically inhabitable, precisely because it arises in the mode of "no-speech". All that it can manifest is "hearkening". As such, the *topos* of discourse is bounded and delimited by "*outopos*", that which does not exist as a "location", but capable of "situating" the place. The "no-place" of discourse or the place of no-speech envelops and gives place to discourse if and only of it is "hearkened", because it does not appear on its own terms. It can be grasped as a "void" that encircles things, which, in the call of conscience appears in the midst of things as "no-thing". As such, it draws Dasein that hearkens to its "no-place", which is an uninhabitable site of dwelling. Yet, the fact that it is uninhabitable does not mean that we cannot define it in terms of its place-character and dwelling. The "ground" [*Grund*] of discourse appears as the abyss [*Ab-grund*], "no-ground". It is the privation of ground, in the sense that it cannot be grounded by something else, and as such it is not a ground, yet it "gives" the "ground": it constitutes the boundaries of the place precisely by virtue of not being a place.[624]

Speaking from his far-Eastern experience on the relation between language and nothing(ness), Kotoh reminds us that Heidegger's 1936–38 Hölderlin lecture courses

[624] The 18th century German philosopher Hamann, who also considered language as *logos* in opposition to reason, talks about the abysmal essence of *logos*. Hamann remarked on his 1784 letter to Herder: "If only I was as eloquent as Demosthenes, I would have to do no more than repeat a single word three times. Reason is language—Logos; I gnaw on this marrowbone and will gnaw myself to death over it. It is still always dark over these depths for me: I am still always awaiting an apocalyptic angel with a key to this abyss". (Johann Georg Hamman, *Hamanns Schriften,* ed. Friedrich Roth, vol VII, (1821-1825), 151.) In addition, Heidegger himself noticed Hamann's designation of language as an "abyss" [*Abgrund*] in his later thought, in the 1950 essay "Language". (See: *Poetry, Language, Thought*, 189)

illustrate Heidegger's grasp of the relationship between language and silence.[625] Kotoh argues:

> It is not *logos*, but the silence as the "basic mood/voice" [*Grundstimme*] that encounters the wonder of the presencing of being."

His concluding remarks are very worthwhile considering:

> One should listen […] belongingly to the sound of silence, which constantly emanates from the depths of the indescribable, and continue to let this be the source of one's own language.[626]

Within that context, Tetsuaki Kotoh goes on to show that "silence", as the actual ground of pure manifestation of reality, connects Heidegger's thought of language with the Zen tradition.[627] What he accomplishes by considering Heidegger's later thought can be achieved in Heidegger's early ideas as well.[628] Silence, as the abysmal ground of discourse, is the opposite of idle-talk that uproots. In other words, idle-talk is the ground that *uproots*, while the silence is the abyss that *grounds*. Let me clarify with an analogy: keeping-silent is not the absence of light, but it is the open window through which the sunshine can enter and illuminate the house. Idle-talk is the curtain, which covers the window glass that does not allow sunshine to shine upon the room. It is in that context "keeping silent" and "idle-talk" appear in terms of the act of grounding and groundlessness.

---

[625] Tetsuaki Kotoh, "Language and Silence: Self–Inquiry in Heidegger and Zen", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987), 210.
[626] Tetsuaki Kotoh, "Language and Silence: Self–Inquiry in Heidegger and Zen", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes, 211
[627] Tetsuaki Kotoh, "Language and Silence: Self–Inquiry in Heidegger and Zen", in *Heidegger and Asian Thought*, ed. Graham Parkes, 201-213.
[628] This is what Brandon Absher achieves in his article focusing on *Being and Time*. Brandon Absher, "Speaking of Being: Language, Speech, and Silence in Being and Time", *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, vol. 30, n° 2 (2016): 204-231.

The significance of the issue of "keeping-silent", which is the event of discourse between silence and expression, which appears within the context of the "call of conscience", indicates that in early Heidegger too a genuine understanding of language requires us to go beyond the limits of a linguistic discussion. The core matter of language does not come into view through an analysis of elements such as syntactic, sematic, or even phonetic structure. The matter at hand is not to find out how language, as a mode of presence, grounds being in disclosing the world, but rather, how "no-thing" grounds language via silence.

IV. 5 The Ground of Groundlessness and The Groundless Ground

After having examined the topological essence of the "groundlessness" of discourse as "idle-talk" and the abysmal ground of language as "silence", I would like to address the issue of "ground". It is important that we must make sense of the notion of "ground" not only as a noun, which has metaphysical connotations such as origin, cause, and foundation. We must rather consider the essence [*Wesen*] and the very happening of the notion of ground in its verbal sense as "grounding", which is indeed related to the issue of the happening of place that situates.

In the previous section, I have mentioned that "groundlessness" [*Bodenlosigkeit*] is not the same as "abyss" [*Ab-grund*], and this idea requires further examination. I have shown that, while the former has an uprooting character, the latter provides the ground itself. The groundlessness of discourse, namely, "idle-talk", occurs in the mode of "fleeing" from the core of the matter. In fleeing, one leaves the site of an appropriate understanding and interpretation. In a certain sense, mindless absorption in the world does not result in a genuine engagement with the world; on the contrary, insofar as it operates

through an average understanding of the world, it abandons the world without having appropriated it. As one has only superficially understood the world, one can also only superficially respond to it. The "groundless ground" as the abyss [*Ab-grund*] is "silence" that occurs from "keeping silent" [*schweigen*], while the ground of groundlessness [*Bodenlosigkeit*] is "idle-talk".

In light of these considerations, I will elaborate on the notions of "ground" and "groundlessness" by looking at Braver's account. In his analysis of Heidegger and Wittgenstein in his work titled *Groundless Grounds*, Braver deals with the ontological and epistemological implications of the limits of language and our being in the world. His main thesis is what he calls "original finitude"[629]. From an epistemological standpoint, he puts forward the argument that in the course of philosophical reflection, at one point the act of providing further justification must come to an end[630]. From an ontological point of view this implies that we cannot ground why we happen to be the kinds of beings that we are. Where the epistemological and the ontological arguments conjoin is that we find ourselves already placed in holistic structures and contexts that constitute our finitude. Likewise, in communication, one's words are meaningful on the grounds that they are employed in ways that are recognizable to the others who share the same background practices. Human existence and its being in the world is through and through holistic and contextual.

I argue that there are three different notions of "ground" in Braver's work. First, in his examination of Wittgenstein, Braver appeals to an epistemological notion of ground. Accordingly, the ground provides the basis and the justification of an argument as well as a form of life. Second, regarding early Heidegger's existential phenomenology, the notion

[629] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (London & Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 2012), 9, 179.
[630] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger*, 208.

of ground appears in relation to the average "being-in-the-world" of human Dasein. It designates the holistic nature of the structure of its being-there and equipmentality. Third, in Heidegger's later thought, being itself appears as the "groundless ground" in a topological way. Braver looks into (1) and (2) simultaneously, however, both of them emerge from the more significant understanding of the ground as the third one: being and language as the "groundless grounds" do not only indicate the contextual limits of giving arguments, or the fact that human existence is contextually grounded in everyday actions. The "groundless ground" implicates that the meaningful manifestation of being itself appears to human understanding as "no-thing". It is "nothing" [*Nichts*] in the sense that it is not a thing, not just any being [*Seiende*] or any occurrence, and as such, the fact that "there is" being [*Es gibt*] is situated in and grounded by the abyss [*Abgrund*] of being. Likewise, silence, appears as the groundless ground of language.

Let me bring into view how "ground" can be distinguished from mere "foundation". Descartes, who is considered the father of modern philosophy, argued that one must first provide the foundations upon which all thinking and scientific explanation could be built. This epistemic position is called "foundationalism", which has been vigorously confronted both by Heidegger and Wittgenstein, and their critique against Descartes' foundationalism is also endorsed by Braver.[631] In searching for the most basic foundation of philosophical and scientific truth, Descartes attempted to prove the very existence of the external world itself. He thought that he provided that foundation with the formulation *cogito ergo sum*. By way of methodological scepticism, Descartes sought after the most elementary and undoubtable "ground" of knowledge concerning existence. According to him, the only thing that he could not doubt was the fact that he has been

[631] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (London & Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 2012), 189.

doubting, which appears as the ground of all his thinking.[632] Upon that elementary and unshakable "ground" of knowledge of self-consciousness, one could build other kinds of knowledge.[633]

As Braver's epigraph from Heidegger's treatise on Schelling[634] draws our attention, Heidegger regarded being as that very groundless ground which orients us in the world as "existence". This means that being itself cannot be grounded by some other kind of being or beingness, precisely because being is not just any entity [*Seiende*]. What can ultimately ground being "is" no-thing. This can be read in two ways: first, nothing can ground being in the sense that being in its happening (event) is the foundation itself. Second, that which can ground being is precisely nothing itself [*Nichts*] by virtue of not being something. It is the limit of being, in the sense that it is that from which being commences. In other words, it is the abysmal ground of being.

In the 1929 essay "What is Metaphysics", in criticizing the scientific way of engaging with the question of nothingness, Heidegger suggests that "nothing" is not mere nullity and it does not mean the mere absence and complete negation of things.[635] In this work, Heidegger talks about "profound boredom" and an ontological sense of "love for the being there in the world of someone" as two sensations that can disclose the being in its wholeness. However, that which reveals "nothing" is anxiety [*Angst*]. The relation Heidegger sees between anxiety, being and discourse is noteworthy: "Anxiety robs us of speech. Because beings as a whole slip away, so that just the nothing crowds round, in the

[632] René Descartes, *Meditations, Objections, Replies*, ed. and trans. Roger Ariew and Doncald Cress (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2006), 13
[633] Here, one should be aware of the onto-theological justification that Descartes provides in the *Meditations* by bringing in the argument of the existence of God. René Descartes, *Meditations, Objections, Replies*, ed. and trans. Roger Ariew and Doncald Cress, 25-26.
[634] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (London & Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 2012), 173.
[635] (*Basic Writings*, 95, 98)

face of anxiety all utterance of the 'is' falls silent"[636] When anxiety robs us of discourse, this is when we are summoned to encounter the matter of language by moving away from our average familiarity with it. As such, our absorbed mode of being in the language is "distracted" where a mindfulness of language can arise. Yet, it is through this very interval that one is urged to heed the "call of conscience" and resituate oneself in and towards language via the interval between silence and speech.

In the previous section I argued that silence occurs as the abyss of the manifestation of discourse. In relation to the relationship between silence and speech, Heidegger makes explicit the connection between nothing and being:

> For human existence, the nothing makes possible the openedness of beings as such. The nothing does not merely serve as the counter concept of beings; rather, it originally belongs to their essential unfolding as such.[637]

In this passage, Heidegger brings into view that "the nothing" is the primary characteristic of the way in which being makes itself manifest, because the nature of being itself is "no-thingness". Likewise, an authentic relation to discourse appears through "keeping silent". Yet, neither nothing is mere nullity in the sense of absence of beings, nor keeping silent is mere muteness in the sense of voicelessness, or not speaking anything. Being is the ground, yet the ground of being is nothing. As such, the ground [*Grund*] of being is an abyss [*Ab-Grund*], not in the sense of a lack of ground, but as the limit and the horizon of the ground that from which and meaningful unfolding of things can come to be. Being, then, is not the emanation and manifestation of no-thingness, but it is simply the limit between no-thing and beings. Just as it is the case in the relationship between being, no-thing and nothingness, "keeping silent", as the dynamic between, constitutes the boundary

[636] (*Basic Writings*, 103)
[637] (*Basic Writings*, 104)

between silence and discourse, just as discourse appears as the region of language within which one can speak in terms of particular entities. However, an authentic "saying" of things requires the back and forth movement between silence and speech by way of "keeping silent" as "hearkening". The grounding of language, then, is the "keeping silent" that inter-relates silence and speech. Dwelling commences precisely at that limit where a *phronesis* of language can come about. With this idea in view, we can now consider the relationship between distinct modes of dwelling that exists in Heidegger's early and late thought.

IV. 6 Being-in-the-World and the Fourfold

The main issue of the concluding section is a juxtaposition of "being-in-the-world" and "fourfold" as two manifestations of dwelling. As I have shown, these two notions designate Heidegger's early and late answers to the question of the meaning of dwelling. In both accounts, the idea of holism plays a major role. However, it must be asked whether the kind of holisms that are at work depart from same or similar concerns. To that end, remaining in dialogue with Braver's account, I will also mention the differences between Heidegger and Wittgenstein's understanding and application of holism.

Braver states: "Heidegger and later Wittgenstein embrace holism, according to which an object or word derives its nature and meaning from its place within a network, all other members of which likewise draw their sense from their interrelationships".[638] Braver calls this "the primacy of the whole"[639]. Indeed, in *Being and Time* Heidegger defended a holistic view of Dasein's being in the world. The totality of significances and

[638] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (London & Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 2012), 81.
[639] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger*, 106.

the web-like structure of tools, human actions and projections showed that the everyday human life is organized in such a way that there is a holistic unity, a context within which all constituents are through and through inter-relational. Likewise, in late Wittgenstein we learn that language is a holistic life form. There are no singular and solipsistic meanings; all meaning and different linguistic uses belong to the holistic unity of the system in which they have their particular use and place.

In Heidegger's early account of dwelling as "being-in-the-world", everyday being there of Dasein also has a holistic nature. That said, there also different kinds of holisms at work which need to be distinguished from one another. Accordingly, 1) early Heidegger's idea of "being-in-the-world" embodies a theory of holism, which can be discussed in epistemological-contextualist terms. 2) Later Heidegger's idea of the "fourfold" also has a holistic structure, however it cannot be fully understood within an epistemological framework because, first, it is neither about cognition nor the relationship between cognition and action, and second, the notion of the "world" that is at issue gathers and situates human beings in a larger context of interrelations beyond human. In other words, the fourfold emplaces human existence in the *cosmos* itself.

Now, the first kind of holism in *Being and Time* concerns the ontological structure of the world in the everydayness, as well as Dasein's spatiotemporal relation to its practical world. While later Wittgenstein's thought of language is similar to early Heidegger's account of "being-in-the-world", the second kind of holism that is at issue is not related to human practices, and the contextual, inter-referential nature of tools and such. The first kind of holism is about Dasein's relation to its closest environment [*Umwelt*] and its attempt to find an authentic relation to that world. In the early work, discourse appears as the relation between understanding and articulated speech. In the later work, language, not discourse, appears as the topological relation between human

beings and being itself, gathering them in the same movement of the event [*Ereignis*]. Now, although it is true that both early and late Heidegger prioritized the primacy of the whole, the most significant novelty in the later account is the non-hierarchical "interplay" between the whole and its parts. The very interplay, the movement between the sky, earth, mortals and immortals is what constitutes the wholeness of the world.

What comes to the fore here again is precisely the definition of "place" and its topological relation to "movement". I claim that if Heidegger's early account of dwelling in language cannot be thought of as topological, this is not only because he does not have a clear notion of place, but also because the notion of language that we can find is an underdeveloped one, as he does not explicate the "movement" [*Bewegung*] that takes place between keeping silent, understanding and discourse. As such, "discourse" in its entirety never appears as the place that gives space and opens up different worlds of meaning, but only as a close space of articulation and an ontological construction that tends to result in "idle-talk" [*Gerede*]. For later Heidegger, the place of the thing does not simply mean its location in the overall whole. Likewise, Malpas puts forward a broader definition of place, as he suggests:

> The idea of place that is invoked here is not, it should be stressed, the idea of that in which entities are merely "located"; rather, in the terms I used immediately above, place is that *open*, cleared, yet *bounded* region in which we find ourselves gathered together with other persons and things, and in which we are opened up to the world and the world to us. It is out of this place that space and time both emerge.[640]

The definition of place that Malpas gives is different from Wittgenstein's understanding of place when he talks about the "place" of the word in a sentence. The meaning of the world

[640] For example, Malpas draws our attention to the relation between the parts in that more dynamic-active sense of movement. Jeff Malpas, *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006), 221.

could only be understood by looking at the way in which the word is used in the larger context[641]. It cannot be figured out solipsistically, but only by looking at the way in which the word is related to the other elements of the sentence. This is what constitutes the context of discourse. However, this is not the only meaning of "context" in Heidegger's later thought.

To that end, we must re-examine the meaning of the word "context" so that we can have a better understanding of the issue when we argue that human existence is through and through holistic and "contextual". Etymologically, the word "context" derives from the Latin *contextus* meaning, "joining and fitting together" of different textures. The verb in the word "texture" is *texere,* which means to "weave" and "make", and is also related to the Greek *techne*. Different cognates of the word derive from the Indo-European root *tekht*- meaning to carve, cut, and build mainly of wood.[642] Though at issue here is an act of fitting different joints together, it is also apparent that, as the verb "to weave" suggests, there is a sense of intertwining and becoming a singular whole.[643] Distinct components of the context do not remain as separate joints; therefore the context is more than the mere jointure of eclectic parts. The context appears in its singular unity, and that unity is not brought about by the addition of some extra binding element either, but by the very action of the "con-joining" itself. The verb *texere*, which means to weave, should awaken us to the topological underpinnings of the notion of "context". To weave derives from the Indo-European root *webh*-, and it means "to move to and fro" [644], which is the basic motion in the act of knitting as well. "Context" first and foremost can be seen as the happening of

---

[641] (*The Philosophical Investigations*, 59) (139. Proposition)

[642] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1971), 757.

[643] As I have discussed earlier in the thesis, the issue is indeed closely related to Heidegger's discussions of the conception of "*der Fug*", as well as *die Fuge* (conjuncture), *fügen* (to enjoin), *der Fügen* (junctures), *sich fügend* (compliant), *die Erfügung*, as the topic of "gathering" becomes significant in his thought in 1930s (mainly in *The Origin of the Work of Art* and *Contributions to Philosophy*) and also in 1940s (*Anaximander's Saying*).

[644] Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language*, 823.

contextualization, which means the dynamic act of intertwining and interlacing of distinct textures. That being said, as Heidegger comes to acknowledge later in his thought in the 1940s, the singular unity of the context essentially emerges from the "disjointure" [*Un-fuge*].[645]

In this line of thinking, we should not understand "to be situated in a context" in terms of mere locatedness in space. Being situated in a context first refers to a sense of "interaction". To be an active part of a context means to partake in the "weaving" motion. As such, it requires movement, but not a movement that merely correlates separate entities, rather as a singular "emergence" that gathers. In the emergence of the context, parts are inherently integrated in the single unity of the whole, thanks to the dis-jointure that exists between the parts. The oneness that manifests itself results from the constant *inter-action* that keeps the constituents of the context together. For instance, if we leave a person in the hallway of a restaurant, this does not mean that she or he belongs to the context of the restaurant. One must dine, cook, serve, clean, or eat in order to be able to partake in the happening of the restaurant. Therefore, mere locatedness in the restaurant does not make one a part of the place. Just as belonging to the place comes with interacting with it, place is where various actions, relations, and interactions occur. That said, the possibility of this interaction depends on the "dis-jointure" and the "rift" between what is present and presencing itself. Every context provides space for an occurrence to take place, and it remains as a whole precisely because it allows for an action to occur, as its contextual nature depends on that very action. Namely, the occurrence is what keeps different parts of the context in relation. If and only if things are situated in the happening of the place, that is, where they have the possibility to interact, then, they can be in relation and get correlated. Heidegger gives an example in the late essay *Building*

[645] ("Anaximander's Saying*", Off the Beaten Track*, 268.)

Dwelling Thinking to explain the relationship between the bridge, the river and the banks of the river. Heidegger writes:

> The bridge swings over the stream 'with ease and power.' It does not just connect banks that are already there. The banks emerge as banks only as the bridge crosses the stream. The bridge expressly causes them to lie across from each other. One side is set off against the other by the bridge. Nor do the banks stretch along the stream as indifferent border strips of the dry land. With the banks, the bridge brings to the stream the one and the other expanse of the landscape lying behind them. It brings stream and bank and land into each other's neighbourhood.[646]

In this passage, Heidegger explains how the bridge discloses a context by gathering the stream, the banks, and the landscape in the same occurrence by connecting the banks of the river. As such, it opens up a world of relations and interactions.

Now, in terms of the primacy of the whole and the holism that is at issue, Braver writes, "Perhaps the most holistic phenomenon, although also the one I can make the least sense of, is the fourfold".[647] Indeed, the idea of the fourfold [*Geviert*] strikes us as the most significant notion of Heidegger's thought from the late 1940s and onwards regarding the nature of dwelling. In light of the definition of "place" suggested by Malpas that I have mentioned before, we can say that the fourfold fulfils two qualities of it: 1) openness, in the sense of opening up of a world, and 2) boundedness, in the sense of providing the horizon and the finitude so that place does not turn into a mere open field without limitations and boundaries. The experience of the place as the open bounded, then, is primarily the experience of the limit. Heidegger argues:

> Only things that are locations in this manner allow for spaces. What the word for space, *Raum*, *Rum* designates is said by its ancient meaning. *Raum* means a place cleared or freed for settlement and lodging. A space is something that has been

[646] (*Basic Writings*, 354)
[647] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (London & Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 2012), 208.

> made room for, something that is cleared and free, namely within a boundary, Greek *peras*. A boundary is not that at which something stops but, as the Greeks recognized, the boundary is that from which something begins its presenting. That is why the concept is that of *horismos* that is, the horizon, the boundary.[648]

It is very important to note that in the text, Heidegger fleshes out the relation between space, place and limit in the very context of the nature of the notion of fourfold. I discussed the notion in the first chapter with regards to the topological essence of language as the happening of place, as that which makes possible the dynamic relation and the hermeneutic movement *between* being and human beings. I started with the notion of the fourfold because it provides the more comprehensive meaning of dwelling in Heidegger's thought.

Now, Braver writes: "The fourfold represents something like the 'logical space' organizing our lives and projects"[649] Here it is not clear what "logical space" here should indicate as an expression, thought the more problematic claim is that the fourfold "organizes our lives and projects". In the idea of fourfold there are no indications of an "organization", because it is neither an established system nor a mechanism that is simply out there, and definitely not something that "functions". On the contrary, as I have discussed in the third chapter, in the age of the domination of the "framework", the happening of fourfold is obstructed. Essentially, the fourfold is a description of the *limits* and relations of dwelling. Therefore, the idea of original *finitude* that Braver highlights as the "finitude without a contrast —or at least not the unavailable contrast with infinitude"[650]— is essential in making sense of the fourfold.

Following the line of thinking in which Braver compares and discusses Heidegger and Wittgenstein, it initially appears that Heidegger and Wittgenstein agree on a holistic

---

[648] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 152)
[649] Lee Braver, *Heidegger's Later Writings: A Reader's Guide* (London: Continuum, 2009), 100.
[650] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (London & Cambridge, Mass.; MIT Press, 2012), 9.

approach in inquiring into the meaning of phenomena. In other words, they both think that philosophy must recognize the holistic nature of the *cosmos*, as well as language that expresses it. It is also helpful to read Wittgenstein and Heidegger within the context of the issue of overcoming of metaphysics. Their thinking imply that today we lack a holistic understanding and experience of thinking and being in the world. As Braver puts it, we are living lives "where glens and dales are bulldozed for Starbucks and McDonalds"[651], and as Heidegger puts it, "nature becomes a gigantic gasoline station, an energy source for modern technology and industry."[652] Again, as Braver deliberately claims, "one need not be a Luddite to acknowledge that something important is being lost."[653] Questioning the ways in which we exist in the world must also lead us to questioning the ways and frameworks in which we think. In that regard, Wittgenstein draws our attention to epistemological inconsistencies of the philosophical tradition, which derive from not properly understanding what we can and cannot do with language. He states: "Once I have exhausted the justifications, I have reached bedrock, and my spade is turned. Then I am inclined to say: 'This is simply what I do.'"[654] In some cases, further theorizing will not make the issue at hand more manifest than it already is. One must rather attempt to develop the *phronesis* of language in thinking so that one knows how to act with language by correctly "reading" our situation in language.

In Heidegger's later thought, the primary holistic context in which humans exist is not the human world. The idea of the fourfold provides a larger context of dwelling, which contextualizes the human being in the happening of place via language. It is the event of language that emplaces the human existence in the circular dance of the fourfold, in that human being finds itself situated as a member, but not the maker or planner of the

[651] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger*, 239.
[652] (*Discourse on Thinking*, 60)
[653] Lee Braver, *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger*, 239.
[654] (*The Philosophical Investigations*, 91)

cosmos.[655] In that regard Heidegger writes: "When and in what way do things appear as things? They do not appear *by means* of human making. But neither do they appear without the vigilance of mortals."[656] This vigilance can exist insofar as human beings have the capacity to respond to that which is beyond them, which requires them to acknowledge their mortality.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger's account of discourse is connected to the notion of "being-in-the-world" as the essence of dwelling. As his understanding of dwelling develops from "being-in-the-world" to the "fourfold", so does his understanding of the core matter of language shifts from the place of discourse in our ordinary dealings to the poetic manifestation of language via silence. However, his account of the "call of conscience" and "keeping-silent" already heralds the change in focus that materializes in his later thought, where the investigation of poetry and art become the central matters of thought. That said, it is already having examined Heidegger's topology of language from the 1940s and onwards that allowed us to identify the implicit topology in the early work.[657] In this way, like Hölderlin's Ister, which follows Antigone in its *ethos*, we have gone backwards and re-membered the source.

---

[655] Capobianco draws attention to Heidegger's Heraclitus lecture course from 1943 and finds a fundamentally topological designation of being as *cosmos*. As we have discussed, he endorses the primacy of the self-manifesting of being-itself against human beings' making sense of it. See: Richard Capobianco, "Heidegger on Heraclitus: Kosmos/World as Being Itself", *Epoché*, vol 20, Issue 2 (Spring 2016): 465-476.

[656] (*Poetry, Language, Thought*, 179)

[657] As Braver beautifully remarks, "The early discussion is like a musical theme that appears in a composer's youthful sonata, only becoming fully developed into a symphony later on". Lee Braver, *Heidegger: The Thinking of Being* (Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press, 2014), 135.

Bibliography

Works by Heidegger

Works in German (GA: Gesamtausgabe)

GA: 2 *Sein und Zeit*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977.

GA: 4 *Erläuterungen zu Hölderlins Dichtung*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996.

GA: 5 *Holzwege*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977.

GA: 7 *Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2000.

GA: 9 *Wegmarken*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1996.

GA: 12 *Unterwegs Zur Sprache*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1985.

GA: 13 *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1983.

GA: 39 *Hölderlins Hymnen "Germanien" und "Der Rhein*". Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1999.

GA: 53 *Hölderlins Hymne*: *Der Ister.* Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1993.

GA: 65 *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994.

GA: 74 *Zum Wesen der Sprache und Zur Frage nach der Kunst*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2010.

GA: 79 *Bremer und Freiburger Vorträge*. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1994.

Works in English

Discourse on Thinking. Translated by John. M. Anderson and E. Hand Freund. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1966.

What is Called Thinking? Translated by Fred D. Wieck and J. Glenn Gray. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1968.

"Art and Space". Translated by Charles Siebert. *Man and World* no: 6 (1969).

On the Way to Language. Translated by Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1971.

Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays. Translated by William Lovitt. New York & London: Garland Publishing, 1977.

The Basic Problems of Phenomenology. Translated by Albert Hofstadter. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982.

Early Greek Thinking. Translated by David Farrell and Frank A. Capuzzi. New York: Harper San Francisco, 1984.

Being and Time. Translated by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1985.

History of the Concept of Time. Translated by Thedore Kisiel Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Nietzsche: Vol I-II. Translated and Edited by David Farell Krell. New York: Harper One, 1991.

"'Only a God Can Save Us': Der Spiegel's Interview with Martin Heidegger (1966)." Translated by Maria P. Alter and John D. Caputo. Reprinted in The Heidegger

Controversy: A Critical Reader. ed. Richard Wolin. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992. 91–116.

The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude. Translated by William McNeill and Nicholas Walker. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Hölderlin's Hymns Germania and Rhine. Translated by William McNeill and Julia Ireland. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Hölderlin's Hymn: The Ister. Translated by William McNeill and Julia Davis. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996.

Plato's Sophist. Translated by Richard Rojcewicz and Andre Schuwer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997.

Pathmarks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

"Traditional Language and Technological Language". Translated by Wanda Torres Gregory. *Journal of Philosophical Research*, vol XXIII (1998).

Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry. Translated by Keith Hoeller. New York: Humanity Books, 2000.

Introduction to Metaphysics. Translated by Gregory Fried and Richard Polt. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000.

Poetry, *Language*, *Thought*. Translated by Albert Hoftstadter. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 2002.

"Seminar in Le Thor 1968". In *Four Seminars*. Translated by Andrew Mitchell and François Raffoul. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language. Translated by Wanda Torres Gregory and Yvonne Unna. Albany: SUNY Press, 2005.

Sojourns. Translated by John Panteleimon Manoussakis. Albany: SUNY Press, 2005.

Mindfulness. Translated by Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary. New York: Continuum, 2006.

Contributions to Philosophy: Of the Event. Translated by Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012.

Secondary Literature

Absher, Brandon. "Speaking of Being: Language, Speech, and Silence in Being and Time". *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, vol. 30, n° 2 (2016): 204-231.

Allen, Williams S. *Ellipsis: Of Poetry and the Experience of Language after Heidegger, Hölderlin, and Blanchot*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2007.

Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open*: *Man and Animal*. Translated by Kevin Attell. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.fg

Aristotle. *Physics I-IV*, vol. 1-2. Translated by Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Aristotle. *Categories and De Interpretatione*. Translated by John Lloyd Ackrill. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Aristotle. *Nichomachean Ethics*. Translated and Edited by Roger Crisp. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Aristotle. *Poetics*. Translated by Joe Sachs. Newburyport, Mass.:Focus Publishing and R. Pullins.

Backman, Jussi. “The Transitional Breakdown of the Word: Heidegger and Stefan George’s Encounter with Language”. *Gatherings*, vol. 1 (2011).

Babich, Babette E. *Words in Blood, Like Flowers: Philosophy and Poetry, Music and Eros in Hölderlin, Nietzsche, and Heidegger*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Babich, Babette and Ginev, Dimitri ed. *The Multidimensionality of Hermeneutic Phenomenology*. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2014.

Baracchi, Claudia. *Aristotle’s Ethics as First Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Bernasconi, Robert. *The Question of Language in Heidegger’s History of Being*. New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1985.

Bernasconi, Robert. “Bridging the Abyss: Heidegger and Gadamer”. *Research in Phenomenology*, vol. 16. (1986): 1-24.

Beistegui, Miguel de. *Thinking With Heidegger. Displacements*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2003.

Borgmann, Albert. *Philosophy of Language: Historical Foundations and Contemporary Issues*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoof, 1974.

Bortoft, Henri. *The Wholeness of Nature. Goethe’s Way toward a Science of Conscious Participation in Nature*. Lindisfarne Books, 1996.

Braver, Lee. *Heidegger’s Later Writings: A Reader’s Guide*. London: Continuum, 2009.

Braver, Lee. *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2012.

Braver, Lee. “Never Mind”. In *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*. Edited by Joseph K. Schear. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

Braver, Lee. *Heidegger*: *The Thinking of Being*. Cambridge, Mass.: Polity Press, 2014.

Brogan, Walter A. *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2005.

Bruns, Gerald L. *On the Anarchy of Poetry and Philosophy*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2006.

Bruns, Gerald L. Maurice. *Blanchot*: *The Refusal of Philosophy*. Baltimore and London: The John Hopkins University Press, 1997.

Buchanan, Brett. *Onto-Ethologies: The Animal Environments of Uexküll, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, and Deleuze*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2008.

Burik, Steven, *The End of Comparative Philosophy and the Task of Comparative Thinking*. *Heidegger, Derrida and Daoism*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2009.

Butler, Judith. *Antigone's Claim*: *Kinship Between Life and Death*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Capobianco, Richard. *Engaging Heidegger*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.

Capobianco, Richard. *Heidegger's Way of Being*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.

Capobianco, Richard. "Heidegger on Heraclitus: Kosmos/World as Being Itself". *Epoché*, vol. 20, Issue 2 (Spring 2016): 465-476.

Caputo, John D. *The Mystical Element in Heidegger's Thinking*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1986.

Casey, Edward S. *The Fate of Place*: *A Philosophical History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1998.

Chanter, Tina and Kirkland, Sean. (eds.) *The Returns of Antigone*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2014.

Crowell, Steven and Malpas, Jeff. *Transcendental Heidegger.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Dahlstrom, Daniel O. *Heidegger's Concept of Truth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Dahlstrom, Daniel O. ed. *Interpreting Heidegger: Critical Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Davis, Bret W. *Heidegger and the Will*: *On the Way to Gelassenheit*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2007.

Davis, Bret W., Schroeder, Briand, and Wirth, Jason M. (eds.) *Japanese and Continental Philosophy: Conversations with the Kyoto School*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011.

Davis, Bret W. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Philosophy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Descartes, René. *Meditations, Objections, Replies*. Edited and translated by Roger Ariew and Doncald Cress. Indianapolis: Hackett Publisihng, 2006.

Derrida, Jacques. *On the Name*. Edited by Thomas Dutoit. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Translated by Alan Bass. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. *Being-in-the- World: A commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time Division 1*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1991.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Wrathall, Mark A. ed. *Heidegger Re-examined* (vol: 1, 2, 3, 4) New York: Routledge, 2002.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Mark A. Wrathall. ed. *A Companion to Heidegger*. New Malden, Mass.:Blackwell Publishing, 2005.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. "Overcoming the Myth of the Mental: How Philosophers Can Profit From the Phenomenology of Everyday Expertise". *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, vol. 79, n° 2 (2005): 47-65.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. "The Myth of the Pervasiveness of the Mental". In *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*. Edited by Joseph K. Schear. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Taylor, Charles. *Retrieving Realism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2015.

Elberfeld, Rolf. "Philosophical Implications of Japanese" In *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Philosophy* (Edited by Bret W. Davis) New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Elden, Stuart. *Speaking Against Number: Heidegger, Language and the Politics of Calculation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006.

Ewegen, Montogomery S. *Plato's Cratylus: The Comedy of Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Farin, Ingo and Malpas, Jeff ed. *Reading Heidegger's Black Notebooks 1931-1941*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2016.

Faulconer, James E. and Wrathall, Mark A. ed. *Appropriating Heidegger*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Feenberg, Andrew. *Questioning Technology*. London & New York: Routledge, 1999.

Fell, Joseph. *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place*. New York: Columbia Press, 1997.

Fielding, Helen. A. "Dwelling with Language: Irigaray Responds". In *French Interpretations of Heidegger: An Exceptional Reception*. Edited by David Pettigrew and François Raffoul, 215-230. Albany: SUNY Press, 2008.

Foti, Véronique M. *Epochal Discordance. Hölderlin's Philosophy of Tragedy*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Fynsk, Christopher. *Language and Relation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1996.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. Translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. London and New York: Continuum, 2004.

Gosetti-Ferencei, Jennifer Anna. *Heidegger, Hölderlin, and the Subject of Poetic Language. Toward a New Poetics of Dasein*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2004.

Haar, Michael. *Heidegger and the Essence of Man*. Translated by William McNeill. Albany: SUNY Press, 1993.

Hamann, Johann Georg. *Hamanns Schriften.* Edited by Friedrich Roth, vol. VII, 1821-1825.

Hatab, Lawrence. *Proto-Phenomenology and the Nature of Language: Dwelling in Speech I*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Translated by Arnold Vincent Miller. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Heisig, James W. *Philosophers of Nothingness*. Honolulu: Hawaii University Press, 2001.

Heisig, James, Kasulis, P. Thomas, Maraldo, C. John. (eds.) *Japanese Philosophy*: *A Sourcebook*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011.

Hemming, Laurence P., Costea, Bogdan and Amiridis, Kostas. ed. *The Movement of Nihilism: Heidegger's Thinking After Nietzsche*. London and New York: Continuum International Publishing, 2011.

Hodge, Joanna. *Heidegger and Ethics*. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

Hölderlin, Friedrich, "Sophokles" in *Sämtliche Werke*, „Frankfurter Ausgabe, 16. Band, Edited by Michael Franz, Michael Knaupp und D.E. Sattler. Frankfurt am Main: Roter Stern, 1988.

Hölderlin, Friedrich. *Hyperion and Selected Poems*. Edited by Eric L. Santner. New York: Continuum, 1990.

Hsiao, Paul Shih-yi. "Heidegger and our Translation of the Tao te Ching". In *Heidegger and Asian Thought*. Edited by Graham Parkes, 93-103. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von. *On Language: the Diversity of the Structure of Human Language and its In Influence on the Intellectual Development of Mankind.* Translated by Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Husserl, Edmund. *Logical Investigations*. Translated by J. N. Findlay. London and New York: Routledge, 2001.

Husserl, Edmund. *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*. Translated by Ingo Farin and James G. Hart. Dordrecht: Springer, 2006.

Hyland, Drew A. and Manoussakis, John Panteleimon. eds. *Heidegger and the Greeks*. *Interpretive Essays*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006.

Inkpin, Andrew. *Disclosing the World: On the Phenomenology of Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2016.

Irigaray, Luce. *The Forgetting of Air*. Translated by Mary Beth Mader. London: The Athlone Press, 1999.

Jung, Hwa Yol. "Heidegger's Way With Sinitic Thinking". In *Heidegger and Asian Thinking*. Edited by Graham Parkes. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987.

Kant, Immanuel. (1998). The *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

"Karl Jaspers to Heidegger, Letter of August 6, 1949". In Martin Heidegger and Karl Jaspers, *Martin Heidegger – Karl Jasper: Briefwechsel 1920–1963*. Edited by Walter Biemel and Hans Saner. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann/München: Piper, 1990.

Kazantzakis, Nikos. *Zorba The Greek: The Saint's Life of Zorba*. Translated by Peter Bien. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2014.

Kisiel, Theodore. *Heidegger's Way of Thought*. New York: Continuum, 2002.

Klein, Ernest. *Klein's Comprehensive Etymology Dictionary of the English Language.* Elsevier: Amsterdam, 1971.

Knox, Bernard M.W. *The Heroic Temper*: *Studies in Sophoclean Tragedy*. Los Angeles & Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Kockelman, Joseph J., (ed. and trans.) *On Heidegger and Language*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1972.

Kotoh, Tetsuaki. "Language and Silence: Self–Inquiry in Heidegger and Zen". In *Heidegger and Asian Thought*. Edited by Graham Parkes. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987.

Krell, David, F. *Intimations of Mortality*: *Truth, and Finitude in Heidegger's Thinking of Being*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1986.

Krell, David. F. *Daimon Life*: *Heidegger and Life Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Krell, David F. *The Tragic Absolute*: *German Idealism and the Languishing of God*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.

Krell, David F. *Phantoms of the Other*: *Four Generations of Derrida's Geschlecht*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2015.

Kusch, Martin. *Language as Calculus vs. Language as Universal Medium*: *A Study in Husserl, Heidegger and Gadamer*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1989.

Laozi. *Dao De Jing*. *The Book of the Way*. Translated by Moss Roberts. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*. Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, translated by Dennis Porter. New York: Norton, 1992.

Lewis, Michael. *Heidegger and the Place of Ethics*. London & New York: Continuum, 2006.

Ma, Lin. *Heidegger on East-West Dialogue*: *Anticipating the Event*. New York and London: Routledge, 2007.

Malabou, Catherine and Jacques Derrida. *Counterpath: Traveling with Jacques Derrida* (Translated by David Wills) Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

Malpas. Jeff. "Death and the Unity of a Life". In *Death and Philosophy*. Edited by Jeff Malpas and Robert Solomon. London & New York: Routledge, 1998.

Malpas, Jeff. *Place and Experience*: *A philosophical Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Malpas, Jeff. *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006.

Malpas, Jeff. *Heidegger and the Thinking of Place: Explorations in the Topology of Being*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2012.

Malpas, Jeff, and Gander, Hans-Helmut, ed. *The Routledge Companion to Hermeneutics*. New York: Taylor & Francis, 2014.

Marcuse, Herbert. *Technology, War, Fascism. Collected Papers of Herbert Marcuse*, vol. 1. Edited By Douglas Kellner. London: Routledge, 1998.

May, Reinhard. *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on His Work*. Translated by Graham Parkes. London & New York: Routledge, 1996.

Meurice, Marc Froment. *That is to Say: Heidegger's Poetics*. Translated by Jan Plug. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

McDowell, John. "The Myth of the Mind as the Detached". In *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*. Edited by Joseph K. Schear. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

McNeill, William. *Glance of the Eye: Heidegger, Aristotle, and the Ends of Theory*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1999.

McNeill, William. *The Time of Life: Heidegger and Ethos*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Mitchell, Andrew. "Heidegger's Later Thinking of Animality: The End of World Poverty". *Gatherings*, vol. 1 (2011).

Mitchell, Andrew. *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 2015.

Montero, Barbara. "A Dancer Reflects". In *Mind, Reason, and Being in the World: The McDowell-Dreyfus Debate*. Edited by Joseph K. Schear. London and New York: Routledge, 2013.

Mugerauer, Robert. *Heidegger's Language and Thinking*. New Jersey and London: Humanities Press International, 1990.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. "Heidegger's Originary Ethics". In *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*. Edited by François Raffoul and David Pettigrew. Albany: SUNY Press, 2002.

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *The Creation of the World or Globalization*. Translated by François Raffoul and David Pettigrew. Albany: SUNY Press, 2007.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Edited by Adrian Del Naro. Translated by Robert B. Pippin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Nikolopoulou, Kalliopi. *Tragically Speaking: On the Use and Abuse of Theory for Life*. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 2012.

Nussbaum, Martha C. "Aristotle on Human Nature and the Foundations of Ethics, with an Addendum". In *The Bloomsbury Companion to Aristotle*. Edited by Claudia Baracchi. London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Olafson, Frederick A. *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Pettigrew, David and Raffoul François. ed. *French Interpretations of Heidegger: An Exceptional Reception*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2008.

Plato. *An Annotated Plato Reader: Clitophon, Meno, Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo*. Edited by Geoffrey S. Bowe and K. Darcy Otto. New York: Global Scholarly Publications, 2000.

Plato. *Timaeus*. Translated by Peter Kalkavage. NewBuryport, Mass.: Focus Publishing, R Pullins, 2001.

Powell, Jeffrey L. "Heidegger and Communicative World". Research In Phenomenology, 40 (2010): 55-71.

Powell, Jeffrey L., ed.. *Heidegger and Language*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Pöggeler, Otto. "Heidegger's Topologie des Seins". *Man and World* II (1969): 331-56.

Pöggeler, Otto. "West–East Dialogue: Heidegger and Lao–Tzu". In *Heidegger and Asian Thought*. Edited by Graham Parkes. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1987.

Radloff, Bernhard. *Heidegger and the Question of National Socialism: Disclosure and Gestalt*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.

Richardson, William J. *Through Phenomenology to Thought*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2003.

Sallin, John. *Delimitations: Phenomenology and the End of Metaphysics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

Sallis, John. *Chorology: On Beginning in Plato's Timaeus*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

Sallis, John. *Topographies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1998.

Sallis, John. *On the Verge of Philosophy*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Existentialism is a Humanism*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007.

Seamon, David and Mugerauer, Robert. ed. *Dwelling, Place and Environment. Towards a Phenomenology of Person and World*. Dordrecht, Boston, Lancaster: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1985

Seamon, David and Zajonc, Arthur. ed. *Goethe's Way of Science: A Phenomenology of Nature*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1998.

Schalow, Frank. *Language and Deed: Rediscovering Politics through Heidegger's Encounter with German Idealism*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.

Schalow, Frank. "Freedom, Finitude, and the Practical Self: The Other Side of Heidegger's Appropriation of Kant". In *Heidegger and Practical Philosophy*. Edited by François Raffoul and David Pettigrew. Albany: SUNY Press, 2002.

Schalow, Frank and Denker, Alfred. *A Historical Dictionary of Heidegger's Philosophy*. Lanham: The Scarecrow Press, 2010.

Schalow, Frank. ed. *Heidegger, Translation and the Task of Thinking. Essays in Honor of Parvis Emad*. New York: Springer, 2011.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Hermeneutics and Criticism and Other Writings*. Translated and Edited by Andrew Bowie. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Scott, Charles E., Schoenbohm, M., Vallega-Neu, Daniela, and Alejandro Vallega. *Companion to Heidegger's* Contributions to Philosophy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.

Sharr, Adam. *Heidegger's Hut*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2006.

Schatzki, Theodore R. “Landscapes as Temporalspatial Phenomena”. In *The Place of Landscape: Concepts, Contexts, Studies*. Edited By Jeff Malpas. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 2011.

Schmidt, Dennis J. *On Germans and Other Greeks: Tragedy and Ethical Life*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.

Sheehan, Thomas. *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.

Sophocles. *Antigone*. Translated by Reginald Gibbons and Charles Segal. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Stenstad, Gail. *Transformations*. *Thinking After Heidegger*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006.

Tatarkiewicz, Władysław. *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*. Warsaw: Polish Scientific Publishers, 1980.

Taylor, Charles. *The Language Animal: The Full Shape of the Human Linguistic Capacity*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press, 2016.

Thomson, Iain. *Heidegger on Ontotheology: Technology and the Politics of Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Underhill, James W. *Humboldt, Worldview and Language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

Vallega-Neu, Daniela. *The Bodily Dimension in Thinking*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2005.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Translated by D. F. Pears and B. F. McGuinness. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *The Philosophical Investigations*. Translated by G.E.M.

Anscombe, P.M.S. Hacker and Joachim Schulte. Oxford: Blackwell, 2009.

Wrathall, Mark A. *Heidegger and Unconcealment*: *Truth, Language, and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Wright, Kathleen. "Heidegger on Hegel's Antigone". In *Endings: Questions of memory in Hegel and Heidegger*. Edited by Rebecca Comay and John McCumber. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1999.

Young, Julian. "Poets and Rivers: Heidegger on Hölderlin's 'Der Ister'". In *Heidegger Re-examined*, vol. 3. Edited by Hubert L. Dreyfus and Mark A. Wrathall. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Zhang, Wei. *Heidegger, Rorty, and the Eastern Thinkers. A Hermeneutics of Cross-Cultural Understanding*. Albany: SUNY Press, 2006.

Ziarek, Krzysztof. "Giving Its Word: Event (as) Language". In *Heidegger and Language*. Edited by Jeffrey Powell. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Ziarek, Krzysztof. *Language after Heidegger*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Zuckert, Catherine H. *Postmodern Platos: Nietzsche Heidegger Gadamer Strauss Derrida*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.